

# The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JULY 17, 1879.

## The Week.

THE death on the 10th inst. of a citizen of Memphis from undoubtedly yellow fever, followed speedily by three cases of the disease in another family, naturally produced a panic in the Southwest. There was a general rush of frightened people to get out of Memphis; the governor of Texas issued a proclamation quarantining the State against "Memphis and other points which may become infected"; quarantine was generally established at all points along the Mississippi River; the Cincinnati Board of Health at once appropriated \$16,000 with which to "place the city in the best possible sanitary condition," and similar precautions were taken where similar need for them was felt; the Chicago grain and provision market declined largely—mess pork, for example, 9 per cent., short-ribs 13½ per cent., wheat 2½ to 3 per cent. Altogether, for a time the recurrence thus early of last year's epidemic was looked for. The panic has, however, subsided, and it seems clear that the danger, if not over, is at least postponed. There have so far been six cases, and no new ones since the 10th inst. The first is said to have arisen from fever-germs shaken out of clothing that had been packed away last year; but there is no explanation given of the others. Memphis is reported "as clean and in every respect in as good sanitary condition as any city in the Union." Nevertheless, aside from the circumstance that this is not perhaps high praise for it, Memphis and the Southern cities generally will probably be all the cleaner for this scare. The National Board of Health, through its executive committee at Washington, has issued a warning circular, advising the free use of disinfectants, pointing out the necessity of cleanliness, and containing instructions as to the proper method of conducting sanitary inspections. The Board, however, has not yet, so far as appears, committed any serious outrage upon the liberties of sovereign States.

Secretary Sherman is enjoying experiences the spectacle of which must make the public financiers of the European despots pale with envy. His estimates of the receipts for the fiscal year which has just expired have been exceeded by \$9,500,000. The customs have brought in \$4,500,000 more than he expected, which we consider a sign of growing prosperity, but which to many people means that the American people is once more plunging into a course of unbridled luxury, and contracting debts to the foreigner which will some day cause the sale of their houses and lands at auction for a mere trifle. The internal revenue has decreased by about \$2,000,000, owing to the proposal in Congress to reduce the tax on those old friends of the politician, whiskey and tobacco, which caused the distillers and tobaccoists to hang back from the market. Congress did reduce the tax on manufactured tobacco from twenty-four to sixteen cents a pound. There was a gain from miscellaneous sources of over \$6,000,000, but this consisted largely of profits on the coinage of silver, and therefore as long as the silver lies in the Treasury is not realized in fact. In considering the increase in receipts, the net surplus for the year being \$7,946,664, it must be remembered that the expenses were increased by the payment of \$5,500,000 on account of the Fisheries Award, the same amount on account of arrears of pensions, and \$1,800,000 paid to Captain Eads for the improvement of the mouth of the Mississippi. No government in the world can exhibit such a magnificent basis of credit as the taxpaying powers of this people supply, and, in fact, their credit has nothing to fear from any quarter but Congress itself.

Public announcement was made last week that the Government engineer inspecting the Mississippi jetties had certified the ex-

istence of a channel whose central depth between them is thirty feet, and at the head of the passes twenty-six feet. This means the completion of the great enterprise, though not, we suppose, the cessation of dredging to keep the channel clear of lumps; and it is still too early to settle the original question in dispute between Captain Eads and the U. S. Engineers about the re-formation of the bar and the consequent necessity of indefinitely extending the jetties. Should this contingency arise, however, we may hope that we shall already have found our profit in the temporary relief to commerce, as well as be able to overcome at a less expense any renewal of the obstacles to navigation. The moral and political consequences of Captain Eads's success are visible in a closer union of feeling and interest between the interior section and that lying along the lower Mississippi and the Gulf, and in numerous ill-considered schemes of internal improvement, partially staved off in Congress, in which the Mississippi occupies the first place, and in which Captain Eads is greatly relied upon. In other words, we might say that the jetties have contributed their share to the "nationalizing" of the Government, just as the yellow fever has done; the South, by a sort of poetic justice, being the chief agent in both cases.

The month has been further signalized (more strictly the event occurred on the last day of June) by the opening of the famous Sutro Tunnel, completed after unremitting labor for ten years. Intended as a drain-tunnel to the richest mines in the world, it surpasses in extent all other constructions of the same kind. It taps the deeper mines of the Comstock lode at the level of 1,750 feet, leaving a remaining depth of some 450 feet, which can now readily be pumped out. Prospecting of course can hereafter be carried 2,000 feet lower, and whether the lode will maintain its richness or the veins be found to "pinch out," as the expression is, is a question of some scientific interest, but of still greater "speculative" interest, involving as it does the duplication of values in the mines of the region. The water from the Savage and Hale & Norcross mines was an hour and twenty minutes in reaching its discharge at the mouth of the tunnel. The cost of this immense achievement of man over nature has been six millions of dollars, mostly furnished by German capitalists. Drainage is only one feature of its usefulness, though not the least. It had as an incidental object the exploration of the formations through which it passes, and this does not cease with the completion of the tunnel. But besides, it provides for the transportation of the ore removed from the mines to mills situated on the Carson River, at a cost sufficiently low to make deep mining profitable.

The steady growth of the *New York Times* in rationality and truthfulness on all Stalwart matters is, to those who remember its state of mind from 1876 even to last year, a most hopeful sign as regards the political outlook. Even two years ago it would have gone into the "exodus" movement with as much tender credulity and holy indignation as General Conway or Wendell Phillips, would have sworn that half a million suffering blacks were assembled on the banks of the Mississippi and prevented from embarking for Kansas by ferocious planters, and would have encouraged Conway and Phillips to go down, as they have threatened, with an army and navy and raise the blockade of the river. It now, however, evidently shares the belief of the judicious that there are no negroes prevented from leaving Mississippi for Kansas by any other agency than the too common one of inability to buy passage tickets, and it makes the following truthful statements with apparent indifference to the Ohio election:

"Reports from Kansas are not favorable to its revival [the exodus]. Some of the persons avowedly connected with it as promoters are not of the kind that commands implicit confidence. Ex-

pectations sedulously cultivated will not be realized. With all its resources Kansas is not the promised land, and its population are not inclined to give the impoverished new-comers a very hearty welcome. Nothing less than the persistent use of the forcing process will enable the professional philanthropists who have the matter in charge to renew the movement with anything like its original vigor. The humane interest awakened by representations conveying the idea of a genuine flight from cruelty, oppression, and want ceased the moment politics were found to be at the bottom of the movement. Honest sympathy with suffering refuses to be perverted for the purposes of vulgar partisanship."

This is hard on the exuberant Conway, but it is the gospel of politics. It is in talk of this kind—plain, wholesome truth—that salvation both for the black and white American lies. Surely the *Tribune* will be moved before long into imitating its rival, and will sell out the theatrical "properties" of Stalwartism, and lead a simple, sincere, and healthy life. The worst of Stalwartism is that it degrades a man to the savage level by the gross credulity it exacts of him. In telling lies one's self there is a certain play of mind which keeps the faculties awake and makes the perception of the beauty of truth still possible. But the effect of pretending to believe other people's lies is altogether besotting and benumbing. Nobody who has passed a year, for instance, swallowing the stories of a Louisiana Custom-house Republican probably ever feels the same again. He may grow tired of these tales and shut his ears to them, but he finds his appetite for ordinary provable facts gone, and his reluctance to reproduce them or reason from them all but unconquerable.

The canvass in neither Maine nor Ohio has reached anything like excitement as yet. In both States the Republicans profess confidence of success. In Maine the Democrats, after a futile attack upon Mr. Davis's "war record," appear to have fallen back upon his obscurity as a statesman. It is asserted that Governor Garcelon forced his nomination upon them, and perhaps this is the reason for the defection of the Democratic *Belfast Journal*, the accession of whose "able and brilliant editor" the *Maine State Press* "hails with unaffected delight." The reason assigned, however, is the Democratic financial unsoundness. In Ohio the two parties have agreed to wait until the 20th of next month before firing the first salvo of campaign artillery. Meantime "Tom" Ewing is to deliver some speeches in Maine, probably to the end of persuading the Greenbackers; and during his absence it is intimated in Democratic circles that "Charley" Foster will devote himself to electioneering of the Colfax sort—a method said to consist in chucking babies under the chin and acquiring an encyclopædic knowledge of voters' given names. Secretary Sherman, however, who is now on his way to Maine, is already announced to deliver some speeches in Ohio after the ball has been fairly opened, and possibly Senator Blaine may be heard from. Mr. Conkling's rumored declination of an active part in the campaign is perhaps accounted for by the latter circumstance.

The Washington correspondent of one of the Stalwart papers reports an interview with "Zach" Chandler, which, if correctly given, makes us fear that there will be rough work in the Senate yet if this statesman does not have his way, and it goes far to account for his bold and defiant attitude towards Jeff. Davis, which many ill-informed people thought so singular. He says that twenty years ago he employed Heenan's trainer to give him boxing lessons for six months, "became an adept in the use of his fists, and got up a first-class muscle, which he has preserved to this day." The italics are ours: "No person," he says, "in the Senate suspects that he is a boxer, and that he can strike a blow of iron," but "if he is ever assailed his assailant will discover that he can defend himself without resorting to weapons." The reporter then by request felt his muscle, and "found it hard as iron, and of enormous size." We shall only observe on all this that it was a dastardly thing to sit a whole session in the Senate with the Brigadiers without letting them know that he was a boxer, and could deal these frightful blows. The Brigadiers thought him an elderly politician

like some of themselves, saturated with whiskey and tobacco-juice, and utterly out of condition. They might, consequently, have been readily betrayed into incautious expressions which might have brought on them a fatal blow from his terrible arm. The crowned heads of Europe, too, who have listened with indifference to his scathing attacks on their system of government, had they known that he could knock any male monarch of them out of time in a single round, would have caused their ministers plenipotentiary to take notes of everything he said, and would even have tried to laugh over his pot-house "stories."

The Legislature of this State at its last session passed an act reducing the legal rate of interest from seven to six per cent. The penalties for usury were left as they stood in the Revised Statutes, and a question has been raised what the effect of the change is. The Mutual Life Insurance Company has published a legal opinion furnished by its solicitor, Mr. O. H. Palmer, which shows that the Legislature has introduced great confusion into the subject. The act just passed follows the section of the Revised Statutes relating to interest, merely changing the rate, but provides that no contract made before "the passage of this act" shall be affected by it. By another section it is provided that the act "shall take effect on the first day of January, 1880." The act was passed, of course, on the day it was signed by the Governor; and the first question arising under it is, What is the effect of the law on contracts between the date of passage and January 1, 1880? The answer seems to be that loans at seven per cent. may still be made until that date. The second question is, What penalties, if any, exist for the violation of this law? The penalties in the existing law are all against the taking of interest above 7 per cent., and the only change made is in the rate. The penalties were all made to attach to the old rate, and the question is whether the change in the rate changes the penal enactment. The statute as it now stands seems to be open to this singular interpretation, that after January 1, 1880, the legal rate of interest will be 6 per cent., but that there will be no penalty for usury unless more than 7 is charged. That is, any rate between 6 and 7 is illegal, while at the same time no punishment for taking it will be enforceable. But, further than this, Mr. Palmer expresses a doubt whether under the recent law there is anything left of the penalties for usury at all. The State Constitution provides that "no act shall be passed which shall provide that any existing law, or any part thereof, shall be made or deemed a part of said act, or which shall enact that any existing law, or any part thereof, shall be applicable except by inserting it in said act." From this it might appear that the penalties now in force cannot, by implication, be made applicable to the new interest law. But Attorney-General Schoonmaker regards the act as an amendment of a single section of the older enactment, and this section is explicitly quoted.

Tammany Hall has found an unexpected ally in the Rev. Howard Crosby, who is betrayed into saying that Governor Robinson has in the pardon of a recent criminal "thwarted every effort of the Society for the Prevention of Crime at securing the good order of the city." This is a grave charge, and we trust his Tammany opponents will admit it to be graver than anything they have yet been able to bring against Governor Robinson. Mr. "Jake" Berry undoubtedly maintained a very disreputable variety theatre in this city, and managed to exasperate the Society for the Prevention of Crime by his repeated evasions of their attempts to suppress him. But the daily papers show apparently ample reason why he should be considered to have by this time expiated his offence. Both the judge who sentenced and the district-attorney who prosecuted him favored his discharge, and there were humanitarian reasons also which Dr. Crosby may not have had in mind when he denounced the offender's pardon. Now, Tammany does not hate Governor Robinson for himself, for his vetoes of Tammany legislation, and his supposed reliance upon the rural democracy, so much as for his personal and political intimacy with Mr. Tilden. Neither does the



*Commercial Advertiser.* Both Mr. Kelly and the machine Republicans of this city are now engaged in an anxious effort to prevent the renomination of Governor Robinson, which to them would mean Mr. Tilden's ascendancy in the State, and a consequent acceleration of his "boom." Against this consummation Dr. Crosby has a perfect right, of course, to labor, and we are far from criticising the wisdom of such procedure; but if his intention is otherwise, it must be a matter of surprise and chagrin to him that his apparently hasty criticism of Governor Robinson has been so profoundly satisfactory to Tammany Hall.

Another week of dulness has succeeded in the financial markets, excepting that for U. S. bonds and other strictly investment securities, which were active and strong by reason of the reinvestment of July disbursements. The Secretary of the Treasury gave notice that he will prepay without rebate all 10-40s falling due on the 18th and 21st inst., the total amounting to \$184,556,300. Holders of these bonds, by promptly sending them to Washington, will therefore get full interest up to their respective dates. Silver in London ruled at 51½d. to 51¾d. per ounce. Here the bullion value of the 412½-grain silver dollar at the close of the week was about \$0.8759. The Treasury has resumed its weekly purchases of silver bullion for the Philadelphia mint. As to the general drift of speculation in "the Street," there is but little to be said, except that the volume of business keeps well up to the average, and that prices as a rule are well supported. Some of the leading operators who have been absent at the watering-places have returned to the city, and their presence has been signalized by increasing activity in certain lines of stocks, more especially the grain-carriers of the Northwest, the future business of which, it is believed, is assured under the improving prospects of the harvest. In mercantile circles, as usual "between seasons," there is a very perceptible lull, but on every hand the feeling, as regards the autumn trade, is very hopeful.

It appears that the story of the existence of a political codicil to the will of the late Prince Imperial was true. M. Rouher brought the will back with him to Paris, and it was read at a select meeting of the Bonapartists. The codicil bequeaths the Bonapartist claim to Prince Victor, the son of Prince Napoleon, passing over his father, and disregarding the Imperial law of succession in a way which has drawn forth many comments on the testator's ignorance or his insouciance. Of course the party cannot abide by this disposition of their cause—a fact which M. Rouher recognized by announcing his withdrawal from public life, as he cannot act with Prince Napoleon. A deputation communicated the contents of the will to the Prince, and acknowledged him as the head of the party, but did not succeed in extracting anything from him beyond an acknowledgment of their courtesy, and to this day he refuses to say whether he will become a Claimant or not. In fact, it is generally believed that he will make no declaration of his intentions, knowing that if he did so he would be promptly expelled from France, and there is nothing he dreads more than exile. This puts the party in a wretched position, but one from which there is apparently no escape so long as Prince Napoleon lives.

Full accounts of the manner of the young Prince's death have been received, and it seems to have been a wretched business. He was present in the British camp simply as a guest, but with every indulgence necessary to enable him to see the war, and he went about seeing it in a most hair-brained spirit. The reconnaissance in which he met his death he undertook at his own desire, and Lieutenant Carey, who accompanied him, was directed not to interfere with him in any way. He started with a small escort of six men, rode off ten miles into the enemy's country, and dismounted, unsaddled, and rested in a place surrounded by thickets; remained over an hour, so that the Zulus had ample time to see him and collect a party to attack him; started for home at his own pleasure; was fired on as he was mounting, and his frightened horse getting away from him, he was speedily overtaken and slain. The affair was, of

course, a most mortifying one to the British officers on the spot, and as somebody had to be blamed, Lieutenant Carey and the escort have been selected for that purpose, because they did not see that the Prince was safely mounted or else return to die with him as soon as they perceived he had fallen—for death was certain had they stayed. Carey does not appear to have comported himself very coolly or heroically, but he probably behaved as ninety-nine men out of a hundred would have done under like circumstances, though not as people who were not there think they would have done. A small party bolting from an ambuscade does not rally readily, and is seldom cool; but then nearly everybody who reads about an ambuscade thinks he himself would have faced about and performed prodigies of valor had he been on the spot, and poor Carey will probably have no defender. There are, however, signs in the English press of shame over the young man's having been allowed to go there at all. The three men of the escort who were killed were as recklessly sacrificed to enable the Prince to play his political game as the dead who died at Saarbrück in 1870. This trip to Zululand was simply an adventure intended to dazzle the French public, and it is not creditable to the British army to have been mixed up in it. The Prince was buried with much military and other parade.

The sensation in England over his death, and the semi-official honors paid to his remains, naturally cause more or less annoyance to the French Republicans, who cannot be expected to see nothing in it but expressions of sympathy with a bereaved mother and sorrow for a young man who fell under the British flag. It was the British alliance which first gave respectability to the perpetrator of the *Coup d'état*, and it is unfortunate but true that the demonstrations in England connected with the Prince's death have given a sort of revival to Bonapartism. The Queen has been most devoted in her attentions to the ex-Empress, and they are doubtless a natural expression of sympathy with a sorrowing woman on the part of a woman who has known much sorrow; but they none the less grate a little on the feelings of those whose brothers and fathers and sons fell in heaps at Gravelotte and Sedan, in a war undertaken at the Empress's instigation for the simple purpose of giving the youth who has just perished a better chance of succeeding his father.

The session of Parliament in England is drawing to a close, for the Chancellor of the Exchequer has made the usual announcement in the House of Commons as to the measures he will attempt to pass and those he will abandon. The only one of importance actually pending, however, is the bill creating a new university in Ireland on the model of the London University, an account of which we gave some weeks ago. The dissolution, it is now acknowledged, will come this fall, and although the Government is probably better prepared to meet the elections than it was before the Afghan war closed, the prospect is not bright. The Cyprus venture is an admitted failure; Lord Carnarvon called attention once more the other day to the indefinite postponement of the reforms in Asia Minor, which the Convention with Turkey provided should be made "without delay," and Lord Salisbury had nothing to answer except that they had done the best they could; the Zulu war is not over, and is full of terrible possibilities, and has revealed the collapse of the British army under the present system of recruitment, which nobody now denies; and though last, not least, Turkey is slowly drifting to ruin, Russia looking on and being now fully aware of the emptiness of the threats with which Lord Beaconsfield stayed her progress last year. Mr. Forster has made an attempt to give the Liberal programme in case of Liberal success. He said they would give household suffrage to the counties as well as to the boroughs; would make a redistribution of representation; they would reform the county government; they would seek to relieve the farmers by facilitating the legal transfer of land, and apply the law of commercial contract to the relation of landlord and tenant, and restrict gamekeeping. These are not bad bids, as the times go.

## WHAT THE WAR SETTLED WITH REGARD TO "STATE RIGHTS."

WE drew attention some weeks ago to the remarkable extent to which the opinions of the politicians of both parties with regard to the powers of the General Government are affected by the politicians' own relation to the General Government. When they are in opposition, and can get nothing from it either for themselves or their constituencies, they are very apt to be champions of "the reserved powers" of the States. When they are in power, on the other hand, or are seeking some grateful application of Federal funds, there is hardly any length to which they are not prepared to go in defence of "the implied powers" of the United States. In fact, the principle on which they appear to interpret the United States Constitution is that the Federal Government is a very strong government when it is in the right hands, but that when the wicked men get hold of it it is little better than a temporary league. There is, consequently, not much to be learned from the late debates in Congress as to the real position of either party with regard to the line between national and State sovereignty. We gave some illustrations of this in the article referred to. We may here add another which is more striking than any of those we mentioned. The Republican Convention at Chicago in 1860, which nominated Abraham Lincoln, put this plank in their platform, which now appears in other terms in all the Democratic platforms of our own day:

"That the maintenance inviolate of the rights of the States, and especially the right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to that balance of powers on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depend; and we denounce the lawless invasion by armed force of the soil of any State or Territory, no matter under what pretext, as among the gravest of crimes."

Should the Democrats get possession of the Government within the next ten years, and begin to use the various powers with which the Republicans have armed it since 1860, for the realization of their own political ideals, there can be little doubt we shall see the Republican party planted solidly once more on the ground of 1860. Nor do we think there is anything to be regretted in this apparent inconsistency. On the contrary, the readiness with which both parties fall into it is perhaps one of the most useful of all the safeguards of our political system. The party in possession of the Government is always disposed to stretch its powers to their last limits, and to disregard or belittle all checks or restraints in the use of them. It is, therefore, part, and a very important part, of the business of the Opposition to resist this tendency, and to insist on strict construction, and it is not in human nature for it to base its resistance upon purely selfish grounds. It naturally supports it with a theory of constitutional interpretation and with the argument of danger to the public liberties, and in so far as it forces the majority to pause and deny itself, it does good service.

What we wish more particularly to point out to-day, however, as in some sense supplemental to our article of June 26, is the exceeding vagueness of the notions apparently entertained by a great many Republican writers and orators of the Stalwart school as to the effect of the war on State rights. *Harper's Weekly*, for instance, seldom refers to State rights except as a "pestilent heresy" or noxious doctrine, which the war is supposed to have killed, and in the eyes of all right-minded people did kill, but which the Democrats are trying to resuscitate. Now, it so happens that the "State rights" which the war killed are not the State rights which are now under discussion, and have not, so far as we have observed, been revived by any Democratic orator of prominence or by any Democratic platform. The State-rights theory which brought on the war, and which the war did undoubtedly dispose of, was the theory that a State has a right to secede from the Union at its pleasure, and *à fortiori* to refuse to permit the execution within its limits of any Federal law to which it objects. This was the old ante-bellum State rights which the Southern Democrats were

always preaching and finally took up arms to enforce. To call this doctrine "pestilent" is to use a mild term. It was simply anarchical, and gave the Constitution the air of a farce. It was impossible, too, to put it down or extirpate it by argument. There was only one way to get rid of it, and that was a resort to force. The war reduced it to the rank of a rather foolish speculative opinion, like the opinion that a man would be justified in killing his father when he gets old, or ought, if he is poor, to have a house rent-free from Mr. Astor. Opinions of this sort are held by large numbers of people, but they are not considered dangerous, or worth notice by the law, because the holders are pretty sure not to try to put them into execution. In fact, the old "State rights" occupy now with us exactly the same place as the right of revolution. Everybody believes that he has the right to revolt if the government he lives under becomes intolerable to him; but nobody considers this a dangerous doctrine as long as there are police and courts. Everybody, too, believes that a State has the right to leave the Union if it can, under certain contingencies; but the war has made the exercise of this right so difficult, and put the contingency which would justify an attempt to exercise it so far off, that it has no practical importance. Discussion of it is hardly more serious or profitable than discussion of "the things that might have been."

The Republican writers and orators of whom we have spoken, however, by a curious bit of mental confusion, treat all denials of Federal power and all attempts to restrict it through interpretation of the Constitution, as assertions of the old right of secession and nullification. They are apparently under the impression that arguing or legislating about a strict construction of a section or clause of the Constitution is necessarily indicative of a desire or intention to overturn the Constitution, and that anybody who talks of "State sovereignty" means thereby to declare that each State is completely and exclusively sovereign; which is absurd and really inexcusable. All Americans are taught in their school-days the nature of the arrangement by which the Federal Government was set up. Each State parted with a portion of its sovereignty and reserved the rest, which constitutes its "rights," and there is nothing dangerous, disreputable, or "pestilential" about them, any more than about a man's right to equal taxation, or to the ordering of his own home. The line which separates the rights of the States from those of the Union, however, as laid down in the Constitution, was somewhat vague. No human ingenuity could make it otherwise. As Chief-Justice Marshall said:

"The Constitution unavoidably deals in general language. It did not suit the purposes of the people in framing this great charter of our liberties to provide for minute specifications of its powers, or to declare the means by which those powers should be carried into execution. It was foreseen that this would be a perilous and difficult, if not an impracticable, task. The instrument was not intended to provide merely for the exigencies of a few years, but was to endure through a long lapse of ages, the events of which were locked up in the inscrutable purposes of Providence."

No mode has been provided by which the interpretation of the Constitution can be protected against those differences of opinion which attend the interpretation of every human convention under which conflicting interests arise. All that can be done is to interpret it reasonably, or, as Judge Story says, "by the aid of maxim which have found their way not only into judicial discussions, but into the business of common life, as founded in common sense and common convenience."

As the nation grows and as its affairs multiply, new applications of the Constitution will constantly be called for; and as often as they are called for, the old dispute as to where the State sovereignty ends and where the national sovereignty begins will break out afresh. There is nothing hurtful in this; on the contrary, this is the proper way of settling in every generation where the line lies. There is, therefore, nothing "pestilential" in contending for a strict construction of the Constitution, or a construction restrictive of Federal powers, any more than for a liberal construction. The war did not decide that strict constructionists were public enemies, or that any view of State rights which told against the exercise of any



power by the Federal Government which the party in office thought useful, was dangerous to the public peace. It simply relegated the right of secession to the limbo of speculation and added certain amendments to the Constitution. But it did not, as some of us seem to imagine, change the rules by which the Constitution is to be interpreted. These remain just what they were before the war, and they furnish now, as before the war, materials for controversy which is in all ways healthy, and promises, we are glad to say, to last as long as the Constitution lasts.

#### FRENCH ACCEPTANCE OF CÆSARISM.

THERE is still a good deal of doubt expressed in the European papers outside France as to the possible effects of Prince Napoleon's death on the fortunes of the Bonapartists. Paul de Cassagnac declares that Gambetta, whom he admits to be a sagacious man, exclaimed, on hearing the news, that the Republicans "had lost their counterpoise," and the story, if not authentic, is probable. It means, if true, that the fear of a Bonapartist revival or reaction helped to strengthen the moderate wing of the Republican party, and that this fear removed, the Radicals of the Clemenceau school would be encouraged and gain ground which the moderate Republic cannot afford to lose. There is no doubt that there is a considerable body of its supporters which it has not carried with it in the Ferry Education Bills, and which the execution of these measures will be very apt to alienate. It may or not be true—it probably is true, if we may judge from the experience of Belgium—that the retention by the priests of a powerful hold on the schools of the country would cause the next generation to be brought up in greater or less hostility not exactly to the Republic, but to the ideas on which the Republic must rest if it is to endure. The Catholic clergy never relished either the social or the political ideal of the Republicans, and since the growth of Ultramontanism they are less likely to relish it than ever, and it is not in human nature for them to refrain from communicating their dislike of it in a thousand subtle ways to the children whom they teach.

Unfortunately, however, it does not seem as if the bulk of the French people, certainly the bulk of the middle classes, were as fully alive to the danger as the politicians. In fact, it would seem as if the Catholic clergy and Catholic monks and nuns were as yet, in spite of all their faults, to most French parents the fittest persons to teach their children. The French public, even the sceptical portion of it, has apparently not as yet got used to the idea of lay instruction for youth, and refuses to believe in its moral safety, so that the Republicans in attacking the teaching orders of the Church touch the prejudices of a very large body of persons who do not ordinarily give much attention to politics, and like or dislike a government rather by reference to its influence on their domestic comfort than to its fundamental principles or its foreign policy. Consequently the Republic is just now, before it is really a year old, for it was only in October last that its existence was assured, weakening its hold on the popular confidence.

This hold has not yet grown strong enough, or lasted long enough, to cause people who dislike the present policy of the Cabinet to look for relief in the regular constitutional way through a change of ministry. In fact, it is doubtful whether the expectation of relief in that way has ever yet obtained a secure lodgment in the political department of the average Frenchman's brain. He is still inclined to fancy that when things are going wrong they must be righted by a change in the form of the government; or, in other words, by a revolution. Many foreign friends as well as enemies of the Republic are now disposed to believe that he is beginning to tire a little of the Republic, and would not be sorry to see it go if something else offered itself in its place that would give him a quiet life. The thing to which he turns when he is dissatisfied with monarchy is the Republic, and so also when he is dissatisfied with the Republic it is feared that he will turn to monarchy, and the kind of monarchy he most easily takes to is, say these critics, not exactly Bonapartism but Cæsarism. To use the words of one of them, the *London Economist*:

"The Imperialist party in France is a considerable one, with a great idea for its creed. That idea is the notion that a large and democratic community, devoted to the theory of equality, compelled by circumstances to remain permanently armed, and exposed to serious social dangers, requires a stronger and simpler instrument to express its will than a large public meeting; that it must, in fact, speak and act through a representative individual and not through a representative assembly. It must both give and receive orders as they are given and received in an army or a ship, and must, therefore, in the common interest, delegate immense powers to an individual, who, for the sake of dignity in Europe, and of the permanence essential to all useful authority, may as well be called emperor as dictator. The desire for such a man is very strong in France, and if the Republic became paralyzed, or if it assailed or threatened the passion of property, or the passion of religion, might become temporarily irresistible."

Now, it may be quite true that this idea is powerful in the French mind, but its force as an agency in shaping events at any particular crisis can only be estimated through historical experience, and this certainly does not entitle it to great weight in making a forecast of the political future of France just now. As a matter of fact, however strong the liking of Frenchmen for a Cæsar may be, they have never either set one up or accepted one after he had set himself up, when any other alternative presented itself. The most prominent fact in French post-revolutionary history is the power of the army, and the only certain conclusion we can draw from it as to the workings of the French political mind is that Frenchmen believe the man who commands the army to be irresistible. They accepted the first Bonaparte as a dictator when he announced himself as such with the army at his back, and they accepted the second Napoleon under like circumstances. The plébiscites by which the seizure and transformation of the Government in these two cases were condoned cannot be taken as an expression of French opinion, for the reason, as we pointed out a fortnight ago, that no choice was open to the voters. If they had all voted No the dictator would not have resigned, and if he had resigned he would have been followed by anarchy. All French revolutions have been essentially an application of the force test to the existing Government, and as soon as it was found not to possess the needful overwhelming physical might no friends remained to it.

There is no good ground for believing that any pretender has a chance in France who is not able in some way to obtain control of the army, and the Republicans have recognized the fact that their great danger lies on this side by the pains they have taken to weed the army of Bonapartist generals. If by any accident or combination of accidents—and any such combination becomes every year less and less probable—the army should escape from the control of the Republican executive, an appeal would very probably be made to the Imperialist idea with success, but only on the principle "Heads I win, tails you lose." It would be sure of success if nothing else offered, and nothing else would offer. No Cæsar presents himself to the people as the competitor of anybody; he presents himself after he has crushed all competitors. In truth, all that can be said of the attitude of opinion in France towards Cæsarism might be said of it anywhere under similar conditions. The desire for "a strong man," and "a steady hand at the helm," shows itself in every country when there is such an uprooting of political traditions that the form of the government has become a subject of debate. It has shown itself even here, owing to the weakening of the Constitution at the South, and would show itself rapidly in England if Parliament had lost its authority. Cromwell had just as little difficulty as Bonaparte in taking possession of absolute power. Of course the part absolutism and centralization have played in French history makes the tendency to accept accomplished facts much stronger among Frenchmen than among other people, as they have really lost the very notion of a *de-jure* government; but it is none the less true that if the Republicans show themselves ready to use the army vigorously to repel opposition, they will never find the Imperialist idea searching for a dictator, or dictators offering themselves for popular acceptance. We must, too, in judging of the possibilities of French politics make some allowance for the influence of the experience and education the country has passed

through since 1849. Much of the reasoning about the future of France takes no account of this whatever, and treats the various factors in the problem as if they remained the same as thirty years ago. But the agitation which followed the 16th of May, 1878, revealed clearly the fact—the testimony on this point was overwhelming—that a new political force had made its appearance on French soil, to which we can give no better name than an intelligent shame about trying frequent experiments in government. That this now powerfully influences French opinion there is no doubt, and the Republic gets the benefit of it for the present.

#### THE LATE PRINCE IMPERIAL.

PARIS, June 30.

REMEMBER as if it were yesterday the day when the unfortunate young Prince who has just fallen under the hand of the Zulus was born in the Tuileries. His birth nearly cost his mother her life. The Senate, the Council of State, the great dignitaries of the court were all assembled at the Tuileries when the guns of the Invalides announced to Paris that a new "Roi de Rome" had come into the world. The young Prince was delicate in his childhood and in his youth. He was educated with much care and surrounded with much pomp. Napoleon III. thought it necessary to surround his son with much prestige. While he himself often went out with a friend, General Fleury or another, in his phaeton, driving his own horses, the "little Prince," as he was always called by the people, never went out without a military escort and without equerries. How many times did I not see the brilliant troop of horsemen with the fine state carriage, and looked in the midst of the dust and the uniforms for the little, pale, delicate, and thoughtful face of the boy who was condemned to all this splendor. He could not enter the Tuileries nor leave them without hearing the beating of drums. He knew that the Pope was his godfather; he played with all the great *cordons* of the European kings and emperors as a child plays with the gown of a doll. I was told that one day, when the Queen of Holland was at the palace, he went out for a drive with the little Prince Alexander, who has now become the heir-apparent of the Kingdom of the Netherlands since the recent death of the Prince of Orange. The guard, as usual, was out; the soldiers presented arms, the drums were beating. The young Dutch Prince touched his cap; the "petit Prince," who was quite a child then, turned to him and said, "This is not for you, it is for me," and bowed.

Little was known outside of the Tuileries of the education of the child. The mystery of etiquette surrounded him on all sides. It was vaguely known that the young Prince was not strong, that he underwent a malady of long duration. It was said that riding had been the cause of it, as he sometimes rode with his father in the Bois de Boulogne. That he was delicate then was quite clear; he had a very fine but very pale complexion. He grew stronger with time, and his education began in earnest. His preceptor was a M. Filon, the learned son of a learned father, who belongs to the French University. His governor was General Frossard, a very honorable but very stern man, an officer of artillery, who had been for some time at the head of the Polytechnic School. The Prince did not attend any lectures in the colleges, but the *devoirs* were sent to him from the Lycée Fontanes. He made the versions and themes at home, and his *devoirs* were sent to the Lycée to be compared with those of the other boys. It is probable that the comparison was not always in his favor; his intelligence was not of the Parisian, quicksilver sort; his illness and his solitary life had been real disadvantages.

He was from childhood a soldier; his portrait was sold in the somewhat ludicrous uniform of a guardsman, with a miniature gun in his hand and a gigantic *bonnet à poil*. His promotion was rapid; he held reviews. I remember his reviewing, by the side of his father, on the Place Vendôme, opposite the famous column, the regiments of the Army of Italy coming from Magenta and Solferino. Such men as Canrobert, Pellissier, and MacMahon were his courtiers. He had few comrades—young Conneau, the son of Dr. Connau, who had helped his father to escape from the prison of Ham; young Fleury, the son of the general who was the most intimate friend and adviser of the Emperor.

Napoleon felt that the rule of his son could not be of the same nature as his own. He was a fatalist; he would take a calm survey of his own career. He knew how he had made the *Coup d'état*, how the *Coup d'état* had given its color to all his reign. He had been, he was, a dictator; he was obliged to strike terror; he dreamed of something better for his son. He was to be a liberal, a constitutional emperor; he would give liberty

to France as well as glory. Alas! what becomes of such dreams? There is a terrible logic in the affairs of the world. Many an adventurer who is trying to make a fortune by foul means thinks that he will leave this fortune to spotless and virtuous children. There is in the paternal and maternal instinct a purity which is not easily destroyed even among the most profligate and the most corrupt.

There is little doubt that the moving force in Napoleon's mind during the latter part of his reign was the desire to leave to his son a firm tenure of power. He reformed the constitution of the empire in order that his successor should hold the position of a liberal sovereign; he plunged into the German war in order to win for the young Prince, who was to share the triumphs of the campaign, the affection of the army. He had himself given Savoy and Nice to France; the "petit Prince" would perhaps give to France the provinces of the Rhine. The "innocent cause of the war" was sent to Saarbrücken, and among the first telegrams of the campaign one is well remembered which described the young Prince before Saarbrücken picking up spent balls on the ground. Then came other telegrams, which have since been made public, one among the others: "We start for Montmédy. (Signed) Filon." The Prince disappeared soon in the great turmoil of the campaign, and we did not hear of him till he arrived in England, where he remained first at Hastings. The Empress joined him there. It was at Hastings that the young Prince was accosted on the beach by the famous Régnier, who asked him for his photograph. It is certain that Régnier entered Metz with the permission of the Germans, and showed to Bazaine this photograph signed by the young Prince, as well as a letter of a person who holds the position of lady-in-waiting near the Empress.

The "little Prince" had fallen from high. He could hardly understand at his age the events through which he had passed. He found himself an exile in England; it must be said to his credit that misfortune gave him an early maturity. After the death of his father he had become the only support and the only hope of one who, though she had not been born for the throne, has shown since her misfortunes that she was not unworthy of it. Those only who have lived in exile can well understand the life which the young Prince led at Chiselmhurst. Did he fully appreciate the vanity of all the hope which was still offered to him by interested, ambitious, and needy partisans; did he measure the inanity of his own efforts; did he understand the events which were passing across the Channel, in the country which he considered still as his own? Exiles draw round them in their little courts what is best and what is worst in humanity; the hand of the police is often offered to them as the hand of friendship; their life becomes contracted, it is spent in frivolous correspondence, in useless plans, in imaginary constructions of impossible events. Hospitality itself becomes a deceit; and the respects paid by an old aristocracy are sometimes made to cover the most frigid interest, if not hostile sentiments. It is the honor and pride of England to offer her hospitality to all the great misfortunes as well as to all the glories of the world; but it requires more philosophy than can be found in the heart of a youth to fathom all the sentiments which are covered by this hospitality.

The "little Prince" became popular; he entered the military school at Woolwich, and went through all his duties with a modest seriousness which was much to his credit. In English society he made for himself an excellent position; he was described to me by some English friends as a quiet, serious, virtuous young man; a good son, a good friend. When the war broke out in the East he thought that he had found an opportunity for learning the art in which a prince, a Bonaparte, ought to be proficient. He did not wish, however, to give offence to any European power; he could hardly fight with the Russians without giving offence to England; he waited, therefore, till Austria was allowed by the Treaty of Berlin to enter Bosnia and Herzegovina, and he asked permission to join the Austrian army of occupation. This permission was not granted to him; very wisely, in my opinion, the Emperor of Austria told the young Prince that he could not accept his services. The campaign was conducted with much rapidity by the Austrians, and was not very eventful.

The Prince thought then of going to Afghanistan; why this new plan did not succeed I could not say with any degree of exactitude. It seems to me probable that the French advisers of the Prince, such as M. Rouher, were afraid at the time that eventually there might be difficulties in Afghanistan and in Central Asia between England and Russia, and they desired the Prince to remain neutral between these two Powers. The Emperor of Russia had always shown some personal sympathy for the young son of Napoleon III. The heir of the Bonapartes was, in fact, barred in every direction; he represented in a certain sense France, or



thought he represented it, and he could not make enemies for the country which it might be his fate to govern. He was, so to speak, an outlaw in politics; if he wished to win his spurs in a war, he was perforce condemned to choose such unworthy enemies as the Zulus. He could not fight against any civilized nation.

I cannot, I must say, condemn the sentiment which prompted him to ask permission to join the English army at the Cape; it was a chivalrous sentiment, a sentiment of gratitude towards the country which had received him in his misfortunes, where he had received his military education, where he had many friends. Nobody will probably ever well know what other feelings were mixed up with this. I doubt myself if there was much ambition, much desire to be noticed for brave deeds in France; this sentiment, though it would have been natural and honorable, was probably not the strongest in a young heart. It was certainly a strange play of fortune to see a young Prince Bonaparte embark in such an adventure. The founder of the fortunes of his family had begun life as a young lieutenant of artillery; he who was to be Napoleon IV. died in the uniform of a lieutenant of artillery. Napoleon I. was the enemy, the prisoner of England; his successor died in the cause of England. "Et nunc Reges intelligite: erudimini, qui judicatis terram," as Bossuet says in the words of the Psalm, at the beginning of the funeral oration of the Queen of England. It would require the eloquence of a Bossuet to do justice to this subject; in the short life of the poor young Prince who fell under the savage arms of an African tribe, he would see united in the smallest possible compass all the extremities of human affairs. "La félicité sans bornes, aussi bien que les misères . . . tout ce que peuvent donner de plus glorieux la naissance et la grandeur accumulés sur une seule tête, qui ensuite est exposée à tous les outrages de la fortune . . . l'océan étonné de se voir traversé tant de fois en des appareils si divers et pour des causes si différentes."

It is not time to speculate on the effects of this event on the future of France, or the possible changes in our politics. It seems superfluous to meditate on such things when a higher power shows us the vanity of all human calculations. It seems odious to draw any selfish hopes out of an abyss of sorrow and misfortune; no words can well answer to such a subject; there are things that speak for themselves.

## Correspondence.

### ENGRAVING ON WOOD.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Have you had enough of wood-engraving; or will you spare me room for yet some words: not to defend my commissions or omissions, my violence or silence, the lucidity of my style or the correctness of my judgment in matters of engraving; but only to clear away, if it may be allowed, some misapprehensions as to what I did write, and as to what are my opinions when not reformed in the alembic of your review?

Where does your reviewer find in my writing that "the original artist should not draw upon the block," or that "an untouched block is the only medium for an artist-engraver"? On the contrary I, not very indistinctly, claimed praise for my endeavors to obtain "drawings from Leitch, Duncan, Dodgson, and others of our painters in water-color, whose style and character I sought to render faithfully, so that the work of the painter rather than that of the engraver should be paramount."

Why also does your reviewer attribute to me the dictum of my gracious opponent in *Scribner*: that tints washed in with the brush prevent the engraver's faithfulness, "because the picture, as a whole, disappears as he works, and the relations of its parts are destroyed by his first few touches"? This—not exactly in these words—is *Scribner*, not *Atlantic*. Neither I nor any other engraver could have written it. We know, on the contrary, that tints washed on a block remain, and the effect remains, and the relations of parts need not be destroyed. With some little care a pencil drawing (rubbed in—I do not speak here of fac-simile) may also be sufficiently preserved.

"In short, to have the picture on the block in any shape tends towards mere fac-simile work, and is not for the artistic engraver." These are your reviewer's words, but intended to express my opinion. How can a washed drawing tend toward mere fac-simile work? And for mere fac-simile, I wrote, not depreciating it, but giving a remarkable instance of its difficulty—"it took the best artist" (as distinguished from the most accomplished engraver) "to do justice to a bare outline."

Let me protest that I did not "pick holes" in the engravings of Mr.

Cole and others. I did not notice any exceptional shortcomings. I wrote only of errors in my opinion pervading the "new style" (which is not new), and unavoidably resulting from the use of the multiple graver. I did not stint praise of Mr. Cole for his artistic work, while sharply distinguishing it from the unartistic—i.e., the mechanical.

As your reviewer says, there may be few modern wood-cuts worth admiring if we "limit our interest to that which shows care for the white line"; and I do not hold up my own for admiration. Nevertheless, I hold up the supremacy of white line. Of twenty wood-cuts by me in this year's National Academy, there were but two (engraved thirty years ago) not entirely in white line; and I cannot recollect having done a single engraving during the last ten years which has not the same distinction. I claim only this virtue for my work. And though "the critical faculty is not given to most men" (I am sure of so much), I may as a practical engraver be able to perceive that the multiple graver will not "work back towards the conception and handling" or the "noble simplicity" of the Bewick school.

Of imitations of charcoal and clay, brush-marks, etc., as "akin to" free and poetical translation, and of the real object and worth of the application of photography, because "there are few artists in America who know well how to draw upon the block," I could say something; but I have already, I fear, trespassed too much upon your space.

W. J. LINTON.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., July 7, 1879.

[When a writer expressly disclaims having meant so-and-so, there is nothing to be said in answer. Our review of the article in the *Atlantic* contained several allusions to the difficulty we found in comprehending it, and, as an illustration of that difficulty and of the kind of utterance which made us think that Mr. Linton meant what he now says he did not mean, we quote a part of one long sentence: "Well, but, I am told, the artist (the 'artist' meaning always the painter, whose picture is photographed, or, worse, drawn on the wood by himself), the artist insists on strict adherence, an exact copy even of his brush-marks," etc. As for the multiple graver, we give it up to Mr. Linton's indignation. Not a word in our review claimed any merit for that contrivance.—ED. NATION.]

### THEOLOGY IN COLLEGES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your recent article on "The Cultivation of Theology in Colleges" suggests one or two questions:

1. Is not the hitherto narrow and denominational treatment of theology due to the fact that it has been left to the several sects, or at best to sectarian colleges, and that the university proper has made it a matter of so "little concern"? The denominations which take the narrowest, least scientific view of theology are notoriously the ones which would withdraw the study of it from the university and isolate it in some petty cloister of the sect. When the recently-founded Episcopal Seminary at Cambridge was projected the University proposed, if I mistake not, that it should be incorporated with the other professional schools of the University, and be put in every way on a par with the (so-called) Unitarian school, with all the rights and privileges pertaining to a corporate part of the whole institution. The offer was, unhappily, declined, and the result was one more petty sectarian school of (one phase of) theology, whereas the other course would, by the unavoidable interplay of views, doubtless have made still less sectarian the only school in the country, so far as I know, which professes to deal with theology as a science.

For (2) is not theology a science as truly as law or medicine, and as worthy of a place among the studies fostered at the university? That the theological school is "a professional school, like the schools of law and medicine," does not seem a good reason for depriving it of the privileges, and, if you please, the dignity, accorded to them. That "the Christian world is divided radically" on certain doctrines, the majority refusing even to consider the views of the minority, does not seem a very good reason for perpetuating a system which, by encouraging one-sided and prejudiced investigation, is largely responsible for such narrowness.

That theology deals with subjects, ethical and others, already in part covered by recognized studies of the university is perfectly true; but the same is true of all the sciences—not one of them but at some point comes in contact with, and at times includes, some other. Certainly it is true of the acknowledged university departments, law and medicine. If theo-

logy includes branches of history and ethics, so also does law ; so also does medicine include in part botany, microscopy, and several of the physical sciences. And if the *practical* aspect of law as teaching how to defend the rights of society and the individual, and of medicine as teaching how to heal the body, does not exclude either of these sciences from the "concern" of the university, why should theology be excluded because in its practical relations it teaches how to lift men to God, when in pursuing its divine calling it needs quite as much as its sister sciences the ballast of discretion and a sound mind, and *all* the light the race has yet acquired ?

H. D. CATLIN.

NORTHUMBERLAND, PA., July 7, 1879.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION :

SIR : An editorial paper on this subject in your issue of July 3 is interesting as the most striking illustration I have lately seen of what Herbert Spencer has so well described as the "anti-theological bias." Spencer tells us that the progress of social science is seriously impeded by two opposite tendencies of thought—the theological bias on one side and the anti-theological bias on the other. The chief purpose of your article seems to be to oppose, as unwise and unnecessary, the attempt of President Eliot to endow the Divinity School of Harvard University with larger funds for its professional work. Perhaps "the anti-theological bias" has never before gone the length of inducing a journal which claims to be friendly to education to grieve over the success of a college in getting larger funds for purposes of instruction in theology. It is therefore curious to look at the argument used for this object.

The reasoning of your article may be thus stated : The purpose of all Protestant churches is to teach denominational doctrine, and the work of a divinity school is to train ministers to give this teaching. There is no other theology which can be taught in the divinity schools, for unsectarian theology does not exist (except in the Roman Catholic Church, where unsectarian theology, it seems, is taught !). Theological schools, therefore, are not wanted in connection with universities.

This is a brief but I think correct résumé of your argument against President Eliot and his endowment. Now, I object to it because (as the French say) it *pèche par la base*. Its foundation is defective. The object of a church is not to teach doctrine, nor that of a divinity school to train men to teach it. The object of a church is to vitalize the hearts of men by showing them the divine truth and love. Its object is, in the first place, religious. Now, it is found more and more that the truths which awaken the religious nature are common to all theologies. Therefore a divinity school which teaches these truths may have an unsectarian theology.

No doubt a great deal of sectarian theology is still taught, and the sharp contrasts of doctrine indicated in your article are still made. But in all denominations the best men reach over these boundaries, take each other's hands, and realize that they are one in Christ. The question, then, is whether there may not be one place where this broader, this inclusive theology, shall be taught—and if so, is not Harvard University good ground for this teaching ? "There is no science of Protestant theology." You might as well say there is no science of optics, because there are different theories on certain optical questions ; no science of medicine, because there are different schools of medical thought. Because much is yet in discussion it does not follow that there is nothing settled. Shall we shut up the medical school of the University because homeopathy and allopathy have not yet settled their dispute ?

You assume that educated people have greatly lost their interest in the Church since they have discovered that no one can teach religious truth with authority, and that ministers cannot throw much light on religious questions. No doubt if the purpose of educated people in going to church is to be taught with authority by a minister what they did not know before, they are quite justified in staying away. But the church, I believe, will long continue a home to those who, educated or uneducated, seek religious communion. Life is cold and dreary to all men, be they ever so highly cultured, who live an individual life outside of the sympathies of their race. The true work of the Church is to unite their souls in a common faith, hope, and love.

The men capable of leading in such communion do not get their power in a divinity school. No, but they go there to have their minds enlarged by the broadest culture ; to be taught judgment and tolerance by the large surveys of history ; to be purified by contact with superior souls ; and to be lifted by each day's study into warmer enthusiasm for helping forward the progress of their race. It is hardly worth while to object to the gift of a few thousand dollars for such purposes as these.

Perhaps, as a Unitarian minister, I should add a word concerning the suggestion that no more Unitarian ministers are wanted. You tell us that there are already "more Unitarian ministers than can find pulpits." The same state of things, however, exists in all denominations and in all professions. There are many lawyers and doctors who can find neither patients nor clients ; but we do not on that account refuse to graduate new classes of practitioners. You also inform us that "the younger generation of Unitarians find their spiritual wants better supplied in the orthodox churches than in their own." Sometimes they do, and sometimes also the reverse is the case. Numbers of young persons educated in Orthodox churches are attracted to religious faith in Unitarian churches. We perhaps receive from the other side as many as we lose—perhaps more. At all events, there is no such movement at present as to call upon us to close our divinity schools.

JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE.

JAMAICA PLAIN, MASS., July 12, 1879.

[Dr. Clarke's "résumé of our argument" is "brief" but hardly "correct." We pointed out that President Eliot thinks it a good thing for a university to be "undenominational" in its attitude towards religion, in which we agree with him. We then endeavored to show that Harvard University carried on a divinity school for the education of ministers of one denomination cut off by a more than usually broad line from all other denominations, and that as long as it did so, and proclaimed that this school was an object of peculiar interest to the Governing Body, it could not obtain either the credit or profit of being undenominational. We did not say pure and simple that "unsectarian theology" was taught in the Roman Catholic Church, and Dr. Clarke's putting this in our mouth in this shape makes us fear he is not good at résumés. We said that there was in the Catholic Church "a theology abstracted from denominational belief" which "it was worth while [for an undenominational university] to keep up a divinity school to teach," because from its resemblance to a body of law interpreted under a court of last resort it was capable of being taught systematically as a science, while Protestant theology consisted in the main of a Collection of the opinions of independent denominational thinkers and commentators. The likeness of the theology taught in the Harvard Divinity School to optics and medicine is something about which we really must let Dr. Clarke have his own way. But we repeat, in the interest of the University, that one of the hindrances to its usefulness lies in the fact that a large body of Christian parents believe it to be a hot-bed of Unitarianism, and do not like the Unitarian mode of "vitalizing the hearts of men" ; indeed, they think it very hurtful, and are unwilling to have their children exposed to it. It is difficult to get people in Massachusetts to understand the force of this feeling in other parts of the country ; but it ought, as it seems to us, to be recognized and allowed for by the managers of the College. We shall be glad to receive from Dr. Clarke a definition of "non-sectarian theology," describing in detail the manner in which it is taught and the view it takes of such questions as the Atonement, the Trinity, Original Sin, Future Punishment, the Nature of the Sacraments, the Relation between Faith and Works, and telling us whether the chair or chairs from which it is to be taught in the Harvard Divinity School can be or will be filled by Congregationalists, or Episcopalians, or anybody but Unitarians. Some explanation of this kind is due both to the subscribers to the endowment, and to parents throughout the country who are asked to consider the College undenominational.—ED. NATION.]

WHERE COLONEL ASHBY WAS KILLED.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION :

SIR : Captain J. A. Judson is in error when he states, in his article on "The Historical Accuracy of the late General Taylor," published in the *Nation* of the 10th inst., that Colonel Ashby was killed by Hatch's Brigade. On the contrary, Colonel Ashby was killed by a detachment of Bucktails (the rifle regiment belonging to the Pennsylvania Reserve Corps) commanded by Colonel Kane, in a sharp encounter on the evening of the 6th of June, 1862, which occurred in a strip of wood about a half-mile west of Harrisonburg, Va. Colonel Kane's detachment was at the time attached to General Geo. D. Bayard's brigade, which consisted of the First Penn-



sylvania and the First New Jersey Cavalry regiments and a battery of artillery. The First Pennsylvania Cavalry was drawn up in an open field on the right of Kane's Battalion, as support, and witnessed the whole affair. The action lasted but a few minutes, but the slaughter was terrible on both sides, as it was at very close quarters. Colonel Ashby's body was removed by his men, but his horse lay dead on the battle-line where the colonel fell. Colonel Kane was wounded and made prisoner. Colonel Wyndham, of the First New Jersey Cavalry, was also captured the same evening. This fight occurred two days previous to the battle of Cross Keys, which was fought eight miles west of this point.

Very respectfully,  
WM. PENN LLOYD,  
late Adjutant First Pennsylvania Cavalry.

MECHANICSBURG, PA., July 12, 1879.

#### ARMY BREASTPLATES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The intemperate language of your correspondent, charging General Taylor with deliberate falsehood in his statement that breastplates and other protective devices were worn by Federal soldiers, is probably best met by the fact that there is in the State Library here such a breastplate, found on a Federal soldier. It is formed of two steel plates, made to wear and look just like a waistcoat, the plates being covered with blue cloth, with United States army buttons. Whether this breastplate came from any of Banks's command I do not know; but an item in a Richmond newspaper of the time, May 27, 1862, states that a major of Banks's army, brought prisoner to Richmond, had on his person one of these breastplates.

An editorial comment in the *Richmond State* of to-day gives living testimony to seeing such breastplates on Federal soldiers, not, indeed, in this instance at Middletown, but at Gaines's Mill or Cold Harbor. Perhaps many persons may be surprised at the wrath awakened in your correspondent's bosom by General Taylor's statement; for the fact that protective devices were used does not necessarily reflect on the courage of those using them. A good Confederate soldier tells me that he knew of their use in our ranks.—Very respectfully,

A. P.

RICHMOND, VA., July 12, 1879.

#### BI-METALLISTS AND BI-METALLISTS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: There are two classes of so-called bi-metallists. They are distinct even to antagonism. Do not let the readers of the *Nation* longer suppose them identical in either theory, method, or object, because of a cognomen to which one of them has no rightful claim.

One class demands free coinage of silver equally with that of gold, irrespective of conditions, for all nations if they will have it, or for one nation though alone in adopting the measure. Of such were a majority of the Monetary Commission appointed under Act of Congress in 1876-7, the supporters of the Bland Bill, and a majority of the voters in the West and South of this country; and of such are those who now urge upon Congress the repeal of all restrictions upon free coinage of silver having the quality of legal tender. They are, some of them consciously but most of them ignorantly, advocates of a mono-metallic *silver* currency in the United States—the inevitable result of the success of their efforts, should it be attained while European governments hold their present attitude on this matter of metallic money.

The other class calls for universal or international bi-metallism. They believe that full use of gold and silver as money is desirable and attainable by concurrent legislation of the commercial nations, fixing a ratio of value common to them all, between the two metals, with the mints of each country open to free and unlimited coinage of both metals. Desiring the concurrence of all the great nations, they believe the desired result can be accomplished by co-operation therein of Great Britain, France, and the United States, because of their united commercial supremacy. Holding that a merely commercial restoration of the old relation of value, 15½ weights of silver to 1 of gold, being fortuitous, an effect of temporary conditions, could have none of the permanence necessary to a useful equalization of value, they believe that bi-metallism proper is not attainable except by the proposed international action.

The former, demanding unlimited and unconditioned free coinage of silver legal-tender in any one country (our own, for instance), would practically cut silver loose from gold, and subject its relative money value to its relative bullion value. It is but just to say that these silver theor-

ists claim that their policy, carried out even in this country alone, would, by its demand for silver to be coined, added to the normal movement of silver to the East, eventually, and at no distant time, restore to silver its old European ratio of value—*i. e.*, would carry silver about three per cent. in market value above the ratio value by our laws. It is not necessary here to argue against their idea that the 400 millions of silver coin in the United States—supposing all money here to be of silver standard, and using so much as 400 million dollars—could raise the value of 1,000 millions in Europe, when its holders in Europe would be only too glad to sell of their stock more and more largely at each advance of one penny per ounce caused by the silver policy of the United States. Just here the international bi-metallists confront the silver-standard men by saying the only true and prompt way to bi-metallism, and elevation of silver to its proper rank and function as money, is by stopping its coinage until it be international; and then by tying gold and silver together at a ratio made steadfast under international agreement. The latter would hold all the silver up to gold value, or gold and silver to one ratio of value in the coinage of both. True, the purchasing power of 4,500 millions distributed in 6,000 millions would be less than if confined within a bound of 4,500 millions that could not be expanded. What the difference in effect on prices between one and the other sum of metallic money would be is not yet known, for silver is yet in part supplementing gold in popular impression, and the separation of gold from silver in money power is not complete. May it never happen that gold shall hold all the purchasing power, even when sharing it with other forms of currency redeemable in gold. It would be a deadly constrictor. Yet, to just that condition is the argument for the gold standard alone leading the world.

The gold standard would confine the transactions of the world, in volume and value, within its own capacity, impossible of expansion as that is, and the capacities of its representatives, all depending on itself.

The true bi-metallist standard would broaden the money basis to include all silver and all gold, with, of course, a corresponding capacity of carrying safely all the many forms of sound credit that must have a basis of good money.

For the present, and probably until experience of suffering shall reverse the popular opinion, it is and will be impossible to change our coinage laws for the better. Let us be thankful for the wisdom that has stayed a further change for the worse. But now bi-metallism offers a great boon and blessing. Accepted by all or a majority of the leading nations, it could do harm to none; it would save us from the impending calamity of *silver standard currency*; and it is believed by many men of large knowledge and position in Europe that its usefulness and beneficence there will be no less than its protecting agency here.

Each of those nations must decide for itself. If they happen to favor that measure which would do us good service, surely we need not hasten to dissuade them.

B. F. NOURSE.

Boston, June 26, 1879.

#### THE ART AMATEUR.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: May I further trespass on your kindness by asking you to inform my friends that all the statements in my letter of July 3 were literally true, and that for remedy against the assertions of Montague Marks, in his reply in the *Nation* of July 10, I have commenced an action at law?

Yours respectfully,

CHARLES A. COLE.

NEW YORK, July 14, 1879.

#### Notes.

MACMILLAN & CO. will publish immediately a volume of essays by Mr. John Fiske on the subject of Evolution, and have also in press Sir Samuel Baker's 'Cyprus as I saw it in 1879,' and 'A Ride in Egypt,' by the Rev. W. J. Loftie. They have just issued Part VII. (first of vol. ii.) of Grove's 'Dictionary of Music and Musicians' (Impropriæ—Libretto). Some of the chief articles are Intermezzo, Intonation, Inversion, Key, Leit-motif (with interesting illustrations, mostly of course from Wagner), Ionian Mode, Irish Music, Kyrie, Leipzig, etc. Living composers and artists like Alfred Jaell, Joachim, Kirchner, and Miss Kellogg are included in the present number; among the dead, Jullien, R. Kreutzer, Lablache, Henry Lawes (who composed the songs for the masque of 'Comus'), and Lassus. To this Netherlands master an almost disproportionate space is allotted, and both his portrait and Lawes's are given—a practice that would have been more honored in the observance than

in the breach throughout this work.—Mr. A. T. Rice, editor of the *North American Review*, has selected a dozen essays from that periodical ranging from 1832 to 1868. Longfellow's "Defence of Poetry" is the earliest production; Lowell's "Shakespeare Once More" the latest. Prescott, Irving, Cushing, Bancroft, Emerson, Motley, C. F. Adams, G. W. Curtis, Dr. Holmes, and F. Parkman are the other contributors. The number of volumes of this sort derivable from the *Review* is almost unlimited. D. Appleton & Co. are the publishers.—Houghton, Osgood & Co.'s reissue of the standard edition of the 'British Poets' has been augmented by Shakspeare and Jonson, and Wyatt and Surrey, each in one volume, Shakspeare's poems alone, of course, being here printed. We have more than once called attention to the cheapness of this excellent series.—Mr. Whitelaw Reid's address on "Some Aspects of Journalism" will be brought out by Henry Holt & Co.—A translation of Pastor Borel's 'Mémorial de Count A. de Gasparin' is announced by A. D. F. Randolph & Co.—D. R. Locke, Toledo, Ohio, announces the publication in book-form of a serial story which has been appearing in his paper, the *Blade*, called 'Andersonville: a Story of Southern Prisons.' Its fidelity is vouched for, and the book will be "illustrated with several hundred engravings, largely taken from Rebel photographs" in the author's possession.—The summer meeting of the National Educational Association will be held at Philadelphia, as we have already announced, July 29, 30, 31. We hope its proceedings will not resemble in one particular those of the American Institute of Instruction lately convened in the White Mountains, at which, according to the press despatch, "after reading 'Love in a Balloon' and 'How We Captured a Mouse,' by Prof. Hibbard, a song was sung by Mrs. West, and the exercises closed."—Prof. A. S. Packard, jr., Providence, R. I., asks on behalf of the U. S. Entomological Commission for information concerning the habits and mode of breeding of the Hessian Fly, the losses it causes, the preventive remedies, etc., and for specimens of the insect, its parasites, and the wheat affected, to be sent as above.—The Seventh Cincinnati Industrial Exposition will be opened for the reception of goods from Aug. 18 to Sept. 9. We believe smoke-consuming devices will form a prominent feature of the display.—The Kalamazoo *Telegraph* states that Professor Alexander Winchell has just been reappointed to the chair of Geology in the University of Michigan. Since leaving this post, some years ago, he has been Chancellor of the Syracuse University and professor of geology in the Vanderbilt University. "The latter position he was compelled to leave owing to his views on the antiquity and geological place of man not agreeing with those of the Southern Methodists."—An historic phase of the Eastern Question is treated by Camille Rousset in his 'Conquête d'Alger' (Paris: Plon, 1879).—Vol. i. and part of vol. ii. of a valuable collection of 'South-Slavic Melodies' has been published in Agram. The collection thus far embraces over 500 songs, from Dalmatia, Herzegovina, Bosnia, Servia, and the adjacent countries.—A German translation of Cesnola's 'Cyprus' is shortly to appear, with an introduction by Georg Ebers. The translator is the Egyptologist, Ludwig Stern.

—The Woodruff Scientific Expedition, in spite of its second failure and the death of its projector, is once more being attempted, under the ostensible management of Mr. William S. Clark, late chief of the "faculty." The programme is essentially unchanged: 40,000 miles of travel are to be achieved in not less than eighteen months, and after doing Europe, Egypt and Palestine, Malaysia and China, "Japan is to be studied carefully." The financial estimate contemplates 200 students at \$3,000 each, payable in advance. This number is to be raised by premiums to agents, and free scholarships to those who secure 600 cash subscribers to a paper to be published on board the vessel; and if such chromo devices fail, a smaller expedition may be despatched experimentally. It is further stated that "a gentleman of culture and large means has undertaken to furnish the funds required to place the claims of the expedition before the public, believing that such an educational institution can be put into successful operation, and rendered permanent." Can it be that this philanthropist is none other than the creditors of the late J. O. Woodruff?

—*Harper's Magazine* for August is a number appropriate to the season both in the subjects of its articles and in the absence in most of them of any serious demand upon the reader's thoughtfulness. Sometimes, as in the case of the opening paper on Lake George, so copiously and felicitously illustrated by Mr. J. D. Smillie, nothing would be lost by disregarding the text altogether. One must speak much more civilly of Mr. W. H. Gibson's "Snug Hamlet and Hometown," in which the

writer's literary sense rather heightens his claims to respect as the designer of the accompanying illustrations, remarkable as they are both for draughtsmanship and engraving. Two other illustrated articles are pretty sure to contain novel information for nine out of ten readers of *Harper's*, viz., Mr. Rideing's account of the New York "Nautical School *St. Mary's*," whose official designation is "Public School No. 90," and the paper entitled "Chautauqua." Chautauqua is a lake in the westernmost part of New York, near Lake Erie, and there an annual summer meeting is held in a sort of camp-ground. Originally designed for the instruction of Sunday-school teachers, especially of the Methodist Church, its aim now is "to give a 'twist' toward learning and culture to minds which would not be apt to receive that learning under ordinary circumstances"; of course, "in the interest of evangelical religion and Biblical truth." Lectureships (including the "Boston Monday") and text-books (specially prepared as well as borrowed), schools of languages and *conversazioni*, a park in which one learns the topography of the Holy Land by walking through it, a sectional model of the Great Pyramid, stereopticon exhibitions, etc., are some of the features of this curious Yankee notion, which has a student membership of more than 8,000 persons. Dr. E. G. Loring discusses in a somewhat alarming way the "Consequences of Defective Vision," and proceeding from the indisputable premise that a near-sighted eye is a diseased eye, he states his belief "that in a great number of near-sighted people the general average of physical vigor would be less than in the same number of those who possessed long sight"—a fact, if it be a fact, which ought to appear in German longevity tables. He furnishes some easy tests for astigmatism and for abnormal vision.

—The July number of the *American Law Review* contains a valuable article on "Common Carriers and the Common Law," by Mr. O. W. Holmes, jr., of Boston, who during the past few years has contributed to the *Review* a number of interesting essays on the development of fundamental legal conceptions. They deserve more than a passing notice. Germany for a long period, as England, though to a less extent since the time when Austin became a familiar name, has been the field for a vast amount of profound research into the origin and nature of those fundamental legal notions, the analysis of which lies at the basis of every system of jurisprudence properly so called; but there are many reasons why it is greatly to be hoped that in the future we may more and more rely on English and American scholarship in this branch of knowledge. All Germans are necessarily Roman lawyers at bottom, and notwithstanding all that has been said about the beauty and system of Roman law, it must be remembered that its system is not that of the common law, and that many of the primitive notions in the latter are to be traced historically to a totally different source from the conceptions which go by the same name in the former. Besides being a civilian, too, every German is a Kantian or Hegelian, while English or American lawyers (if they consciously profess any philosophy at all) belong generally to a widely different school. Everybody knows how in the classical Roman period the discussion of first principles by the commentators was colored and distorted by the prevailing philosophical ideas imported from Greece; and it is consequently easier to understand how a commentary by a modern professor on such a subject, let us say, as Possession, may be profoundly affected by his Kantian or Hegelian education. With regard to common carriers, the law of England and the United States is very peculiar, and it is Mr. Holmes's object in the essay before us to show that it is not Roman but Teutonic in its origin, and may be traced back to the period of the folk-laws, when the German races were still in a pastoral condition; when cattle formed almost the only known species of property, cattle-stealing the most serious offence against property, and a regulated self-redress the only remedy known to the law. As we understand his argument it, is that the curious and anomalous rule of law which makes (for example) the New York Central Railroad absolutely responsible for the loss or destruction of every piece of freight entrusted to it, unless this is due to an "act of God" or the public enemy, or unless a special contract is made with the shipper, is merely a survival from primitive times in the case of a particular class of persons (common carriers) of a principle of law which once affected all persons entrusted with the keeping of the property of others. We cannot here do more than give the barest hint of the drift of Mr. Holmes's essay. We trust that it may with its predecessors be soon collected into a volume. The publication would redound greatly to the credit of American legal scholarship.

—One of the papers read at the recent Library Convention spoke of



the exclusion of "immoral and French fiction" from the libraries as quite a matter of course. The current *Blackwood* has an elaborate critical and homiletical article upon "French Novels," the sixth in its "Contemporary Literature" series, from which a similar conclusion might be drawn. The question of admitting this literature to public libraries is, of course, a practical and a complex one, and we do not mean to discuss it; but the two circumstances associated furnish an apt illustration of the customary Anglo-Saxon attitude towards French fiction, and that, so long as it is the attitude of immaculateness towards pitch, is worth attention. Of course there is an explanation, if not an excuse, for it. There are many things which they order differently in France; a young girl in a good French family would no more be permitted to look into one of Octave Feuillet's novels than a young English or American girl would be permitted to read 'The Age of Reason.' Consequently, the limitations of its audience being well understood, the French novel is more plain-spoken than the English, and it is in great part from its plain-spokenness that the unwarrantable assumption of its immorality proceeds. There are, indeed, plenty of immoral French novels, but perhaps not more than there are of immoral English ones. For the matter of that, a pretty long argument might be entered upon as to whether 'The Wide, Wide World' and its sort are not more immoral at bottom than 'Les Amours de Philipe' and its sort. It is certainly a misfortune to quarantine what may be called a whole literature, and includes such literary artists as Balzac, George Sand, Flaubert, Mérimée, Cherbuliez, by stigmatizing them as immoral. But it is a ridiculous misfortune to do it on such grounds; for the superiority of the average French novel, which the writer in *Blackwood* admits, though with a very wry face, is largely due to the opportunity that it has and the English novel has not of being plain-spoken; it occupies itself strictly, almost always, with painting life as it is, and not with the production of romance which has no relation to reality except in the novelist's imagination, unchecked by any considerations of literary art. "Since the author of 'Tom Jones' was buried," says Thackeray, "no writer of fiction among us has been permitted to depict to his utmost power a man. We must drape him and give him the conventional simper." Absolutely nothing stands between truth and the writer of French fiction, and he does depict men and things to the utmost of his power. The real objection to French novels lies in the application of the maxim, "The truth should not be spoken at all times." That is the reasonable ground for the libraries and English essayists to take, and not the untenable one of maintaining that a romantic idyl of André Theuriot is less pure and sweet in itself than 'The Vicar of Wakefield.'

—Americans, even more than his own countrymen, will be interested in an article which Mr. John Wisker contributes to the *Fortnightly Review* for July upon "The Colored Man in Australia." The title might as well have been "The Chinese in Australia," since what is said of the black aboriginal and the brown Polynesian is both brief and, from the nature of its subject, of small comparative importance. The Chinese question, however, is in Australia even more prominent perhaps than it is in California. The Celestial is as great a nuisance and a terror to the Australian as he is to the San Francisco "hoodlum"; the slang term for his invasion is "the Yellow Agony," and though no Australian Kearney appears to have arisen, and the colonial governments seem to have respected treaty provisions, what are called "repressive measures" of great stringency and efficacy have been adopted to the end and indeed with the result of apparently, and temporarily at least, settling the question. The history of these measures Mr. Wisker gives at length and with great dispassionateness, although he attempts no disguise of his substantial sympathy with them. As a matter of fact, the Australians seem to have much more ground for complaint than the Californians. There are 4,000 Chinese in Sydney alone; 20,000 out of a population of 200,000 in Queensland; in Cooktown they are in a majority. As Mr. Wisker says, "these figures do suggest a serious question," which is, as he goes on to show, whether or no the European population unassisted by repressive legislation will be able even to hold its own. He does not dispute the "general right of the employer to get his work done at the cheapest rate," nor does he favor any violation of Great Britain's treaty obligations, but he maintains "the undoubted right of the colonies to self-preservation," and with this, it seems clear to him, unchecked Chinese immigration would seriously interfere. It must be admitted, however, that since the recent colonial legislation in the matter, the danger is not imminent. "The Chinese Immigrants Regulation Act has achieved its object," he says, "that of preventing immigration altogether" in Queensland; and similar measures elsewhere will undoubtedly have the same

effect. To most Englishmen, Mr. Wisker acknowledges, this legislation which does indeed seem both grotesque and tyrannous, will appear "monstrous." But he says that "the Australian is fully convinced that the issue is one of life or death, and that where the Chinese are the Europeans will sooner or later cease to be," and it is plain that he agrees with the Australian. "For the yellow men to settle down amongst a people with whom they can no more amalgamate than oil can mix with water, is merely tempting Providence." And he advises the Chinese to colonize by themselves. The whole pith of the question both in Australia and in California is certainly here: whether or no the yellow men's hostility or indifference to white men's civilization is likely sooner or later to imperil that civilization. Abstract economic propositions as to "cheap labor," etc., are slight in comparison.

—Bishop Gilbert Haven's "boom" for Grant at the Woodstock Fourth of July symposium, contrived by Mr. Bowen, of the *Independent*, contained many passages which we should like to transfer to our columns. We reluctantly pass over the glowing tributes to Boss Shepherd and Mullett and their works, and the complete if not hearty sanction of the San Domingo job, in favor of the more general whitewash applied in the following paragraph:

"The splendor of that height of national sovereignty and human equality which was attained in the administration of Ulysses S. Grant will be yet more illustrious as we wriggle at the base of the mountain from whose summit we have descended, in vain efforts to scale its heights and bask again in its sunshine. Even as the foaming, writhing, idiotic mouthings of the weak lad possessed with the devils, from which neither himself, nor his father, nor even the disciples and associates of the Lord could deliver him, contrasted painfully to the three apostles with the glories of the Mount of Transfiguration."

This comparison, to those who have still some regard for moral standards and some recollection of Grant's administration, will appear as shocking as Mr. Froude's recent likening of Caesar to Christ, and, coming from a dignitary of the Methodist Episcopal Church, even more disgusting.

—The *London Week*, a weekly paper established two or three years ago by Mr. Louis J. Jennings, formerly editor of the *New York Times*, has just died. The *World*, of this city, made gallant efforts to sustain it by referring to it and quoting it as one of the highest authorities on British affairs, but in vain. All the serious weekly papers in London are suffering more or less from the competition of the new "society papers," which are, owing to a curious and sudden deprivation of the public taste, having a prodigious run, their main ingredient being social gossip, mostly mendacious. Mr. Jennings's *forte*, however, lay neither in the judicial-mindedness of the serious weeklies nor in the flippant gaiety of the society papers, and there is no market in England for heavy "slogging," as the pugilists say, such as he used to deal out on his enemies here. The support of him by the *World* is a most curious case of magnanimity. Mr. Jennings used to express in the *Times* the lowest opinion possible of the present editor of the *World*, and when the late editor was supposed to be on his death-bed he referred on one occasion not sympathetically, but exultantly, to the tortures of anticipation with regard to the future life which he supposed him to be suffering. Journalism is certainly becoming a sweeter and tenderer calling than it used to be, at least in these parts.

#### THE STUDY OF PSYCHOLOGY.\*

THE student in psychology who goes to this first posthumous volume of George Henry Lewes in search of new inspiration and direction will be disappointed. Nothing that has not already been written in the 'Problems of Life and Mind' appears here. There are the old warnings against the erection of Abstractions into Realities, and the dangers of Analysis unsupplemented by Synthesis; the familiar insistence on the importance of the Social Medium, and the hollowness of "hypothetical physiology"; while the reduction of Body and Mind to different Aspects of the same ultimate, Feeling, reappears and permeates everything. But Mr. Lewes was too experienced a literary workman to repeat and capitalize without a purpose. The present Problem, "published separately in obedience to an implied wish of the author," is evidently in some degree intended for the general public, and so reasserts with considerable amplification what were believed to be the needs of a scientific psychology.

Perhaps Mr. Lewes's chief merit as a philosopher was a continuous insistence on penetrating the significance of words. Certainly his most valuable and characteristic contributions to psychology show him con-

\* 'Problems of Life and Mind.' By George Henry Lewes. Third Series. Problem the First, the Study of Psychology: Its Object, Scope, and Method. London: Trübner & Co.; Boston: Houghton, Osgood & Co. 1879.

stantly in the attitude of watching his own stream of thought, and investigating the credentials of each word in the sequence. Highly abstract thought is carried on almost wholly with verbal signs, and these are generally accepted as ultimates. The philosopher is too apt to question everything but the words he questions with; their subtle trickery goes unsuspected as they float him along the stream of inference.\* This perennial error is so disastrous that one who had probed it might well repeat and re-repeat warnings against its manifold forms, as Mr. Lewes did in every 'Problem of Life and Mind,' and continued to do in the volume just issued.

The first and third chapters of this work, under the titles "The Object" and "The Position of the Science," define the relation of psychology to physiology; insist on the biological standpoint, from which mind is to be viewed as a function of the organism; and criticise the views of Mill, Comte, and Spencer as to the subject-matter of psychology. "The place of Physiology is that of the organic conditions of production; the place of Psychology being that of the products." "Psychology is a branch of Biology, having for its special province the analysis and classification of the facts and laws of Sensibility viewed in their subjective aspect." "It is not the presence of Consciousness that marks off the phenomena as those of an unique science, but the presence of a particular point of view, a theoretic attention to the feelings as feelings."

Function and Faculty are then placed in luminous antithesis: function is what is fixed, unalterable, the instinctive, the mechanical; faculty is what is modifiable, acquired in the individual experience. Function is the connate constitution, the inherited mechanism; faculty the acquired constitution, a modification impressed upon the inherited mechanism by experience. Here lies the difference between man and animal. Speaking broadly, animals have functions; they build nests, seek food, shrink from pain; men have functions and faculties; traditional inheritance endows them with language, music, all the post-natal culture. (The songs of birds are undoubtedly a case of traditional inheritance.) This brings into view the importance of the Social Medium (chap. v.) The stuff out of which the faculties are built is not the experience of isolated individuals, but the collective experience of the race. Even were our knowledge of the organism enormously extended, "it would still be incompetent to furnish an explanation of moral sentiments and intellectual conceptions, simply because these are impersonal and social, arising out of social needs and social conditions, involving, indeed, the organism and its functions, but involving these in relation to experiences only possible to the collective life."

Animal psychology, on the surface so promising, is considered for the present infertile; partly because of the inaccessibility of animal subjective life, and partly through the constant liability to anthropomorphic misinterpretation. And since animals possess no developed society, there cannot be studied in them that General Mind (chap. ix.) which has been the efficacious environment of humanity. The General Mind traces itself in the intellect, the moral sense, in what are significantly called the *Humanities*—in all forms of culture; and has its record in history.

Concerning the Method of psychology little that is new is brought forward. The need of using both introspection and observation (objective) is emphasized; no one questions that now. Indeed, one of the chief deficiencies of this work in the eyes of special students will be that just nothing is said of the immense amount of observational work accomplished during the last fifteen years in objective psychology. Fechner, Helmholtz, Wundt, in Germany; Sully, Grant Allen, Romanes, Galton, in England, and Stanley Hall at Harvard have labored with admirable results. There is great need now that some one should sift these results, show their general significance and drift, and formulate a method and a programme for future work. It would be impossible to estimate the future importance of scientific psychology too largely; and that full efficiency may most quickly be attained psychology must pass the stage of individualism and be constituted a science.

Mr. Lewes had already shown the misfortune of subjective psychology in having been born of Metaphysics, and taught us what ancestral traits might profitably be retained and what called for eradication. This last volume, with the "Physical Basis of Mind" as a groundwork, might very appropriately have contained the much-needed systemization of ob-

jective psychology. It is sufficiently seen that the "longing to get behind things" is little else than a desire to find the centre of a circle outside the circumference, and there are enough who believe that if this universe does not suffice for our activities and our interests the fault lies not in the shallowness of things, but in the shallowness of our vision. What is wanted is that those who labor in this belief should be guided and inspired by a common conception of their object and their method.

*Memoir of the Life and Episcopate of George Augustus Selwyn, D.D.* By the Rev. H. W. Tucker, M.A. (New York: Pott, Young & Co. 1879.)—George Augustus Selwyn, Bishop of New Zealand for twenty-six years and of the ancient diocese of Lichfield for eleven more, ending in 1878, was born in 1809, of an ancient family, to which George Selwyn, the wit and friend of Horace Walpole belonged. At Eton he was a classmate and intimate of Gladstone, and he was a member of the Cambridge crew in the first of the now famous races with Oxford. He took kindly at once to the idea of a clerical life. His first parish was Windsor, where he attracted notice by a pamphlet or two and by his distinct organizing talent, and at the age of thirty-two was selected as the man to be the first missionary bishop of New Zealand. He was personally handsome, athletic, skilled in many practical occupations not usual to his profession, and quick to turn his hand to others. Had he not been a good bishop he might have made a capital farmer, carpenter, weaver, or printer, it is said. Something of all these, as well as the Maori dialects, he learned in order to start them properly in his colony. He sketched, but by no means so well as to justify the praise that "he was a born artist"—praise founded upon letters, with pen-and-ink illustrations of natives, their huts and landscapes, one of which is lithographed in *fac-simile*, and run in among the text. He was in particular a sailor. He began to familiarize himself with the details of navigation on the long voyage out from England, and afterwards had plenty of use for them. A part of the episcopal outfit was a small schooner, and in this he made constant voyages, often three thousand miles at a time, visiting in turn the numerous islands belonging to his spiritual domain. The mission ship, *Border Maid*, is described coming up to Auckland with the bishop at the helm. "Luff, my lord!" cries the captain. "Luff it is," my lord bishop sturdily replies.

His piety was not of the mystical order, but he gave too many proofs to allow its sincerity to be doubted. It is pervaded, like all his transactions, with a strong Anglo-Saxon common sense. He had, as we have said, the organizing faculty. He saw definite points and devoted himself to reaching them in the directest manner. In all his memoranda, sermons, propositions for this and that, he is fond of putting down the paragraphs with numbers, 1, 2, 3. It was a natural tendency, strengthened no doubt by the childish simplicity in point of intellect of his savages. One only of his speeches to them is given in full. It is short, but too long to reproduce here. There is something quaint and very pleasing, partly in its directness, partly in the turns of expression borrowed from them. It was on the occasion of his appearance in a grand conclave of the Maoris, who were meditating war, to endeavor to persuade them to better counsels:

"Here am I, a mediator for New Zealand. My work is mediation. I have eaten your food; I have slept in your houses. The council of Wai-kato has agreed that to-day I should be allowed to speak my mind to you. Well, then, carefully weigh these special thoughts:

"Let the law be one.

"Let the Waitara question be decided by law.

"Let Tataraimaka be occupied quietly by the English owners.

"First, let the law be one."

He goes on to show that there should not be one law for one Maori and another for another, or a different law for Maoris and Englishmen—nothing special, but general laws applying fairly to all alike.

"Therefore I say to you, agree to this first thought of mine, 'Let the law be one.'

"Now for the second point, 'Let the Waitara case be decided by law.' This is not my idea alone. It is yours, William Thompson (a chief); it is yours, Ngatikahungunu; it is what we all said. The fault Governor Brown committed was that he did not try the Waitara question by law. This was my sickness, that it was not tried. This is my medicine, that it should be tried by law. It was one man of yours who began the wrong, namely, Te Teira. It was one man of ours who continued the wrong, Governor Brown. Now all of us together, the whole body, will set right the wrong of one member."

Here follows again, like a kind of refrain: "Agree, then, to this second word of mine, 'Let the Waitara question be decided by law.'"

The first missionary bishop was not the first missionary. The coun-

\* For example: Explanation is the resolution of a phenomenon into its ultimates. These ultimates are explained by reduction to a lower grade of ultimates. When the final, the true ultimate is reached, further resolution becomes impossible. Now, philosophy attempts to explain that last ultimate, not seeing that the question of explanation is irrelevant, resolution being at an end. The office of explanation is a vanishing factor that becomes zero when Existence, which, as such, cannot be resolved, is reached. Here the word *explanation* is not sufficiently questioned: like many others, it is allowed to extend beyond its proper area.



try had been in hand thirty years, and very tolerably Christianized by Catholics, Dissenters, and what not, together with Church people. The picture given of the natives—it is tantalizingly fragmentary—represents them in an attractive light. They were gentle, easily amenable to ideas of law and an orderly life, humane in war, and at the same time of fearless courage. The troubles were all about the tenure of land. There were no individual, but only tribal proprietorships. Transfers were continually being made, under the inducement of that eternally seductive "British gold," by unauthorized persons. Indeed, it must have been rather difficult to tell just who had the authority. At any rate, some of the land was paid for three times over, and then had to be fought for besides. The bishop was very active in these disturbances. Passing from one side to the other in the interests of conciliation, he managed to lose the favor of both. He was hooted by the settlers at Taranaki, who said he was greedy of power and was truckling to the natives to get all the land for his churches. Then the natives refused him passage on his journeys, saying he was only coming through their country as a spy. But he sat down imperturbably on his bundle, and said good-humoredly: "This is very fine. The Pakehas (the settlers) grind me at Taranaki, and now you grind me here."

The old difficulty of the conflict of Christian sects among themselves, from which no missionary field is quite free, was a very tangible retarding influence to evangelization. In one place the natives were found warned against Hahi (Church) and in favor of Weteri (Wesley). At another a fierce dispute was raging as to whether the reformatory fires at Smithfield, of Queen Mary or those of Queen Elizabeth, were the most orthodox. "Here have I come," says a logical old chief, in substance, stretching out three fingers, "to a point where three roads branch forth. This is the Church of England, this is the Church of Rome, this is the Wesleyans. I am sitting here. Which shall I take?" They took their religion in a rude way at the best, as benighted intellects must. A youth who had completed his education at the college wished to take home poison from the laboratory to administer to his enemies, and was surprised to learn that it would make any difference, inasmuch as they were not Christians. When the troubles came Christianity was identified with lack of patriotism, and there was a great backsliding. Some few even went to the extreme of relapsing into cannibalism.

We fear we may have given a more attractive idea of the book than it deserves. It might possibly be little less than dreary to the general reader. The great bulk of its contents is letters such as are written by millions every year, and what may be called the *technique* of a denominational religious life—the spreading of communion tables, and the administering of confirmations. It manages, by a lack of imagination, to make the least possible of the strange, remote archipelago, and at the same time to avoid presenting the bishop as the stirring model for the imitation of youth which his career would well have warranted.

*Life and Adventures of Ernst Moritz Arndt.* Compiled from the German. With a preface by John Robert Seeley, M.A., Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge. (Boston: Roberts Bros. 1879.)—The basis of this compilation is Arndt's autobiography ('Erinnerungen aus dem äusseren Leben'), which has been on the one hand abridged, on the other usefully supplemented from his other personal writings and from numerous biographies. The result is a work of lasting interest, and one of the best possible introductions to the history of Germany during and immediately after the Napoleonic era. The charm of the narrative fully justifies Prof. Seeley's comparison of it, in his preface, to the historical novel, which it far surpasses in value. Arndt's life was at every stage romantic. Born on the island of Rügen, under Swedish rule, with *Platt-deutsch* for his mother-tongue and High German, blunderingly spoken, the etiquette of festive occasions, at a time when, as he says, people were less educated but "possessed more individuality, more variety, and more poetry" than they did half a century later, his happy boyhood was passed by the sounding waters of the Baltic within sight of the Pomeranian shore. Education in the universities of Greifswald and Jena took him to the mainland; in the early days of the French Revolution he "was still at heart more Swedish than German"; but "when Austria and Prussia had fallen after vain struggles, then first I began to love Germany truly, and to hate the foreigner with an utter hatred." Before this catastrophe he had travelled in Sweden, Italy, and France, of which he gives lively pictures. Afterward, as the apostle of German nationality, of that unity which was not attained till 1871, he followed Stein to Russia, where, as Gortchakoff said

of his own country after the Crimea, that part of Prussia which would not submit was gathering itself for the recoil; and thenceforth, till the overthrow of Napoleon, he had the singular honor to be the instrument and associate of Stein, who knew how to employ his great gifts as poet and prose-writer in kindling the patriotism of an overridden people, and preparing it for the tremendous sacrifices which at last enabled it to drive out the invader for ever.

The amount of incident and reminiscence of famous personages in these pages is very great. Perhaps the most valuable observations are those of Russian character; most graphic and horrible the account of the French retreat from Moscow, with Stein and Nemesis following close behind. All that we learn of Stein is conveyed in that language of affectionate admiration which he inspired in all his chosen "family." There was a special bond between Arndt and his chief in their hatred of serfdom. Arndt's early 'History of Serfdom in Pomerania and Rügen,' though it caused him to be regarded as a seditious person by his aristocratic neighbors, fixed the attention of Gustavus IV. upon the evil, and probably hastened as well as preceded the edict abolishing serfdom (1806-1810). Stein's first act as Prussian minister, after the Peace of Tilsit, was to put an end to attachment to the soil, and to make ownership in land a common privilege. The reaction, too, which began with the Congress of Vienna compelled Stein's withdrawal from affairs, and for twenty years kept an official seal on Arndt's lips under which he chafed away the prime of his life. Their friendship remained unbroken to the last.

The modesty proper in an autobiography and natural to Arndt prevents the reader of this volume from forming a just idea of his peculiar services to his country and his age. Even such of his lyrics as are here introduced are tamely translated. Professor Seeley himself being responsible for a version of

"Der Gott, der Eisen wachsen liess, der wollte keine Knechte,"

which begins—

"Who underground the iron stored  
Cared not to see a slave."

In all other respects the translation, and in nearly all the editing, is to be praised. Copious foot-notes contain brief and generally satisfactory biographies of the more noteworthy characters mentioned in the text. In the spelling of proper names there is the usual want of consistency, but nothing is quite so bad, or so likely to escape detection by the ordinary reader, as "Nicholas Durjeneff," on p. 300, for Nicholas Turgeneff, the Russian secretary of Stein, and colleague of Arndt in the Central Administration at Frankfurt; the one Russian whose name should be mentioned before Alexander II.'s in celebrating the emancipation of the Russian serfs, and whose 'Mémoires d'un Proscrit' deserve to have been consulted by the present editor. Finally, there is no index—a grave omission.

We might stop here, but shall be forgiven, we believe, for making two extracts from the autobiography for their psychology rather than their historic value; the first from p. 194:

"During my Russian night-journey I made an observation which amuses me still when I think of it. It was only a recurrence of a sensation which I had experienced in similar nights, never in Germany but often in Sweden, when my senses were over-excited through wakefulness. I think it was partly caused by the strange lights and shadows of the northern nights, whose starlight and moonlight is quite different from that of Germany, and has a magic proper to itself. Anyhow, the trees, the rocks, the houses, and other lifeless forms seemed suddenly to come to life and to spring forward as we passed, like magic monsters. I do not know whether this effect is produced by the action of outward objects upon the mind, or of the mind upon outward objects. About this philosophers will probably dispute till the end of time, but the fact remains the same, and in my opinion accounts for much of the belief in supernatural appearances in Sweden, and also for Swedenborg's spiritualism."

The other is from p. 25. Arndt's father lay dangerously ill:

"I applied myself diligently to the only source of comfort I knew of, and read hymns from the hymn-book, and the Gospel for the week, aloud to myself over and over again, and offered devout prayers with all my heart. At last in my great trouble I began to ask myself whether there was nothing which I could offer up to God as a sacrifice for my father's life. I considered everything in the house and all my brothers and sisters, but I felt that I had no right over their lives. At last I came to myself, but found that I did not wish to die yet. So there was nothing left but my doves, and these I offered to God with fervent prayer and many tears."

The next morning his father was out of danger, and the dove-cote was found desolated by a marten. This coincidence of course made a great impression on the boy's mind as a manifestation of Divine Providence; but what will strike readers who remember the case of Freeman,

the Cape Cod Adventist who murdered his child as a sacrifice which he hoped the Lord would not exact of him at the last moment, is that Arndt's first thought of a victim was among his brothers and sisters. That he would have been content with offering the life of one of them, in no way distinguishes his fanaticism from that of Freeman, whose views about the millennium may accordingly be suspected not to have been at the bottom of his dreadful crime.

*The Æneid of Virgil.* Translated into English. By John D. Long. (Boston: Lockwood, Brooks & Co. 1879.)—*A Rhythmic-Prose Translation of Virgil's Æneid.* By Henry Hubbard Pierce, U.S.A. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1879.)—There appears to be a connection between politics and translating from the classics which leads men who are engaged in the former to employ their leisure with the tasks of the latter. In late years, especially, several English statesmen have shown a marked preference for such work, and perhaps it was their example that induced Mr. Long to set the same fashion for American politicians by printing this translation of the Æneid. He accounts for it himself by a wish he felt to pay "a mite of tribute to the old studies," and he found that the principal pleasure which he derived from his labor lay in renewing "the happy morning of the school-boy's shining face and eager heart." Some stronger motive than having once read Virgil, some deeper pleasure than being a boy again, is needful for a good version of such a poem, and it goes without saying that not much is to be expected from a translator upon whom his work has taken so little hold that he can speak in his preface of this "immortal poem, though the world could better lose it all than a psalm of David or a verse of Whittier." The translation is usually accurate and sometimes spirited; but the graces of the most elegant of poets do not readily lend themselves to Mr. Long's abrupt and doubtful English. Anachronisms are boldly acknowledged in the unfortunate preface, but there are graver faults. Defective taste has made several passages inharmonious and unnatural. Virgil would not have spoken of the "cowed household gods" of Troy, *victosque Penates*, nor of the "sacred wares," *sacra*. The "fallow heart" of Dido for *desuetudine corda*, "chuckling" Cupid for *gaudens*, "milling war" for *cerealiæque arma*, are all unpoetic, and these are examples taken at random. For minute criticism we have no space, but what is to be said of such lines as the following:

Quam mille secutæ  
Hinc atque hinc glomerantur Oreades.  
"A thousand mountain nymphs  
In bosky clusters following here and there."  
Liquefactaque saxa sub auris  
Cum gemitu glomerat.  
"While the air  
Glooms ever with the hissing molten ball"  
Pedibus celerem et pernicibus alis;  
Monstrum horrendum, ingens: cui quot sunt corpore plumæ  
Tot vigiles oculi subter, mirabile dictu.  
Nocte volat cæli medio terræque per umbram  
Stridens."  
"If swift  
Of foot, yet swifter with malicious wings,  
A monster huge and shapeless she, with eyes  
That lurk, but never close, as many eyes  
As feathers on her trunk.  
She sweeps at night half way  
Twixt heaven and earth, and buzzes as she goes."

These examples of inaccurate or tasteless renderings might be continued indefinitely, but enough has been adduced to show the defective scholarship and unrefined poetic feeling with which the translation has been made. Force and spirit are not infrequent, but these go but a little way in making a good version, and they alone will not make this one a rival of the many already before the public.

Captain H. H. Pierce's translation is more unpretending, and, in our opinion, more valuable. It was the work of his leisure hours in garrison, and was a labor of love. It is written in versified prose, a form of translation the capabilities of which have never been sufficiently worked out; in reading it there is some difficulty in avoiding a sing-song incidental to all writing of this sort, but on the whole a better music is conveyed than in the rough-hewn blank-verse which is more commonly the medium of translators. We have noticed some doubtful renderings, but none which it is worth while to specify. It was intended for the author's children to lead them "to a greater zeal in classical pursuits," and it is excellently adapted for such a purpose, as well as for older readers.

*The Life and Letters of Madame Bonaparte.* By Eugene L. Didier. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1879.)—The recent death of Ma-

dame Bonaparte, and the still more recent death of Prince Louis Napoleon, and the consequent newspaper gossip and speculation, give this volume the interest of timeliness at the least. The readers of such of Madame Bonaparte's correspondence as has been published lately in *Scribner's Monthly*—quite as much because it was a literary "find," perhaps, as because of its merits as magazine literature—need not, however, look to the additional matter here printed for anything new or different, although at least two-thirds of the book now appears for the first time. There is much repetition in the letters, and Mr. Didier's editing of them seems to indicate that he saw no reason for any real editing at all. His work is, at all events, of the most superficial sort, and bears the same relation to the text that an argument bears to a play. He does, indeed, observe that "this Baltimore girl, married at eighteen and deserted at twenty, seems to have possessed the *savoir vivre* of Chesterfield, the cold cynicism of Rochefoucauld, and the practical economy of Franklin," and he prefaces and supplements the correspondence with an historical account of some length. But the reader would have been quite as well satisfied if more careful journeyman work had replaced his magniloquence. As it is, the reader will have to do his own editing without even the comfort of being able to "skip" with security. And it may be added that the circumstances which give the book its interest of timeliness, united to its previous substantial publication, prevent its having in any noteworthy degree the interest of freshness. Nevertheless, it contains the materials in abundance for an entertaining volume, and has the charm which always attaches to the correspondence of a witty woman—especially if she has had the varied and interesting experience which Madame Bonaparte had in such extraordinary measure. The intimate personal habits of thought and views of life and the world, the whims and peculiarities of individuals with whose exterior life alone history can concern itself, are disclosed with a frankness and naïveté never to be found, of course, in premeditated publications; and it is these, naturally, which form the main attractiveness of the letters. One may know all about the external history of Madame Bonaparte's picturesque career, and still find himself following the intimate narrative of it here given with a new zest and pleasure in the views which its side-lights afford of several characters intrinsically as well as historically interesting.

*Practical Boat-Sailing.* By Douglas Frazar. (Boston: Lee & Shepard.)—This is a useful little book, evidently written by a sailor. Its purpose is to afford instruction to the amateur yachtsman in the art of handling small craft in inland waters, and there is no attempt made to teach the science of navigation. The names of sails, ropes, and rigs are given and explained, the meaning of the simpler nautical terms stated; and there is much clearly expressed advice to beginners about sailing a boat. The rules of the road at sea are lucidly explained by diagrams, and there is also instruction in the use of charts. Tables are given for determining the distance at which objects on the water can be seen, for finding the difference between the true and apparent direction of the wind, and for ascertaining the length of miles of longitude at different latitudes. The remarks about ballasting a boat, about the management of the sheets, sounding, anchoring, and steering, and the explanations of how to make bowlines, hitches, and knots, are capital. The amateur is shown how to "box his compass," how to throw the log, and how to steer in and out of port by buoys and bearings. There is, finally, a good vocabulary of sea-terms.

The only criticism we have to make is that the author seems over-confident as to the possibility of teaching seamanship out of a book. He says the book is written "for the purpose of enabling any person, after a perusal of its pages, to feel confident of handling a boat so as to be perfectly safe." This is to claim too much, for of all arts that of seamanship must depend on experience. Nerve, resource, and presence of mind make the sailor, and these qualities cannot be acquired from books. The author also speaks of pulleys instead of "blocks," which grates on the nautical ear.

*The Great Fur Land; or, Sketches of Life in the Hudson's Bay Territory.* By H. M. Robinson. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1879.)—The spirit of trade and adventure which has been the dominating characteristic of the English people for so many centuries, has had no more striking illustration than in the two mammoth corporations which came into existence towards the close of the seventeenth century, under the names of the "United Company of Merchants Trading to the East Indies" and the "Governor and Company of Adventurers of England Trading into Hudson's Bay." Both of these companies are similar in the



great extent of power they have wielded, extending far beyond the mere limits of trade and embracing all the functions of government, in the influence which they have had upon the political fortunes of the mother country, and in their subsequent fate of transferring their lands to the Crown and returning to their normal functions of trading corporations. In these respects they stand without rivals in the history of the world. But no greater contrast can be imagined than the two countries to which the respective companies directed their trading energies. One opened up a warm southern land with all the rich, varied productions of the East, and the other penetrated a howling wilderness extending to the Arctic Ocean, whose only product desired by civilization was furs. One has added nearly two hundred millions of subjects to the English Crown, and thrown the course of English politics into a direction full of complications, of which no man can now foretell the result; the other has acquired and surrendered to the Crown a territory larger by one-third than the whole extent of Europe, but peopled only by a few hordes of savages and a few thousands of such settlers as were imported into it, and their mixed descendants.

It is with this latter company, the lands occupied by it, and the life of its servants and their employes that the present book deals. In an easy, pleasant style of narrative the author describes these cold, barren lands; the modes of travel, by dogs and sledges in winter, by canoes and Red River carts in summer; the organization of the Hudson's Bay Company, the character of its officers and the dreary life which they lead at their remote posts; the thoughtless, devil-may-care nature of the half-breed voyageurs, and the admirable way in which they serve the company's purpose; and the Indians living within the company's lands, and their customs and habits. Taken altogether, it gives to persons who have passed their lives in cities or thickly-settled communities a glimpse of a life so wholly different from their own that they will either throw the book aside as containing nothing which can in any way interest them, or else will follow it to the end with the keenest curiosity. The subject is by no means a new one. Its more solid features have been long since presented to the world by McLean's and Martin's accounts of the Hudson Bay Company, by the reports of Dawson's and Hind's explorations, by Archbishop Taché's sketches of the inhabitants; its romance and adventure have been delineated at great length by Butler in his 'Great Lone Land' and 'Wild North Land,' and by other books and sketches. The present book occupies an intermediate place between these; it has little or none of the solid information of the exploration reports, and it is altogether free from the overworked sentiment and doggerel which are so disagreeably frequent in Butler's books. But, on the whole, it seems to us to give a crisper and truer picture of the life in that cold, weird region than any of them. The description of the great autumn hunt of the half-breeds, for example, leaves nothing to be desired in order vividly to portray the whole scene to the mind. The style is generally pleasing, though in a few instances in descriptions of scenery it is a trifle florid.

*Lettres de Jean François Ducis.* (Les Classiques français, édition nouvelle, publiée sous la direction de M. Paul Albert, Professeur au Collège de France.) (Paris, 1879. 8vo, pp. 390. New York: F. W. Christern.)—The name of Ducis is familiar to all who have studied the career of Shakspeare's works in France as that of the author of the wire-drawn French tragedies of "Hamlet" and "Macbeth," in which Talma proved himself the first actor of his time. It may fairly be doubted whether anything more than his name is generally known. To the present edition of his letters M. Paul Albert has prefixed an interesting biographical sketch. Born in 1733, Ducis brought out in 1769 "Hamlet," the first of his eleven tragedies, and, like the most of them, the result of Le Tourneur's translation of Shakspeare. As M. Albert aptly says, all that Ducis saw in a play of Shakspeare's was a situation, a strong scene, and a moral to be drawn, for all his tragedies are written with distinct moral purpose. The moral of "Hamlet" was the duty of filial devotion. The success of his first play

brought him into notice, and the court offered to adopt him as a successor to De Belloy, the author of the royalist "Siege de Calais," and to take him up as a tragic rival to Voltaire. But the gentle and modest nature of Ducis shrank from a courtier's life and he declined. On Voltaire's death he was elected to the vacant chair in the French Academy. The Revolution found him a sincere republican, who followed with interest and hope the career of the young Bonaparte. But when Napoleon seized the supreme power the poet opened his eyes, and his love for the hero gave place to a contempt and hatred of the tyrant. Napoleon, who liked Ducis, tried in vain again and again to bribe him; he offered him the cross of the newly-founded and highly-prized Legion of Honor; he nominated him as Senator, a position to which a fine salary was attached. Ducis was seventy years old and poor, but he declined the offers of the emperor as he had before declined the offers of the king. Ten years later, in 1810, Napoleon tried again, and had the name of Ducis put on the list of authors who were to receive a decennial prize, but again the aged dramatist refused. With Napoleon's favorite actor, Talma, Ducis was most friendly; the tragedian may almost be called a collaborator in the author's plays, so many were his hints and suggestions; and at last, in 1810, Talma's sister married the nephew of Ducis. In his later years (he died at the age of eighty-three) he was almost the sole survivor of his generation, and as such the younger authors looked up to him with veneration and affection, of which a most singular proof was given in 1801, when he brought out his last tragedy, "Fedor et Wladimir." The play failed the first night, and without consulting him four of the most prominent tragic poets of the time, including Joseph Chénier and Lagouvé, the father of the living dramatist, united in revising the piece and in trying to get it into shape, and with such success that on the second performance the tragedy was received with favor, although its life was not long. The two hundred and thirty-five letters M. Albert has gathered together show clearly the simple nature of the poet, and occasionally shed a little light on the society and usages of his time. It is sometimes urged as an evidence of the decline of the drama in our day that the scene-painter is unduly important, but Ducis writes to a friend that the scene of his "Abufar" is so fine that it calls forth a round of applause on the rising of the curtain; and this was in 1795.

\* Publishers will confer a favor by always marking the price of their books on the wrapper.

## BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Authors.—Titles.	Publishers.—Prices.
Alden (Ellen T.), Stories and Ballads for Young Folks. (Am. Book Exchange)	
Boardman (Rev. G. D.), Epithames of the Risen Lord. (D. Appleton & Co.)	\$1.25
Bolles (A. S.), Industrial History of the United States. (Henry Bill Pub. Co.)	
Cullum (Gen. Geo. W.), Biographical Register of Officers and Graduates of the U. S. Military Academy, 1822-1867, vol. III. (James Miller)	5.00
D'Anvers (N.), Raphael. (Scribner & Welford)	1.25
Dacey (A. V.), Law of Domicil. (Stevens & Sons)	
Dowson (Prof. J.), Classical Dictionary of Hindu Mythology, etc. (Trübner & Co.)	
Elint (Prof. R.), Anti-theistic Theories. (Scribner & Welford)	4.25
Harrison (J. A.), Spain in Profile. (Houghton, Osgood & Co.)	1.50
Head (P. R.), Van Dyck; Frans Hals. (Scribner & Welford)	1.25
Holst (Dr. H. von), Constitutional and Political History of the United States, Vol. 2, 1828-1846. (Callaghan & Co.)	
Longfellow (H. W.), Poetical Works, illustrated, Parts 1-6, swd. (Houghton, Osgood & Co.)	50
Mollet (J. W.), Rembrandt. (Scribner & Welford)	1.25
Meyers (R. C.), Miss Margery's Roses, swd. (T. B. Peterson & Bros.)	50
Molloy (J. L.), Our Autumn Holiday on French Rivers. (Roberts Bros.)	1.20
New Encyclopedia of Chemistry. (J. B. Lippincott & Co.)	20.00
Nichol (Prof. J.), English Composition. (Macmillan & Co.)	45
Nicholson (E. B.), The Lights of an Animal. (Kegan Paul & Co.)	
Oncken (Dr. W.), Alchemie (schlichte, Grosse, swd. (B. Westermann & Co.)	
Pierce (Capt. H. H.), Rhythmic Prose Translation of Virgil's Æneid. (J. B. Lippincott & Co.)	
Pole (W.), Philosophy of Music. (Houghton, Osgood & Co.)	3.50
Porter (Mary W.), Poor Papa, swd. (D. Lothrop & Co.)	50
Reception in honor of Rev. O. B. Frothingham, swd. (G. P. Putnam's Sons)	55
Rice (A. T.), Essays from the North American Review. (D. Appleton & Co.)	2.00
Robinson (H. M.), The Great Fur Land. (G. P. Putnam's Sons)	1.75
Rood (Prof. O. N.), Modern Chromatics. (D. Appleton & Co.)	2.00
Savage (Rev. M. J.), Life Questions. (Lockwood, Brooks & Co.)	1.00
Sawyer (Rev. L. A.), The Final Theology, Vol. I. (M. B. Sawyer & Co.)	
Secones (W. D.), Goethe's Faust, metrically translated. (Trübner & Co.)	
Shakspeare and Jonson, Poetical Works, 1 vol. (Houghton, Osgood & Co.)	1.75
Skeat (Rev. W. W.), Reprinted Glossaries, xviii-xxii, swd. (Trübner & Co.)	
Souvestre (E.), Attie Philosophier in Paris. (D. Appleton & Co.)	
Stern S. M., Studien und Vandenlen. (Henry Holt & Co.)	1.35
Stimmungsbilder aus dem Verwichen einer alten Frau, swd. (C. Reisner & Ganz)	
Taylor (Rev. L.), Greeks and Goths. (Macmillan & Co.)	
Van Loon (Mrs. E.), Under the Willows; a Tale. (T. B. Peterson & Bros.)	1.50
Whitney (J. L.), Catalogue of the Spanish Library bequeathed by George Ticknor, swd. (Boston)	
Wyatt and Howard, Poetical Works, 1 vol. (Houghton, Osgood & Co.)	1.75
Young (J. B.), Around the World with Gen. Grant, Parts 3, 4, 5, swd. (Am. News Co.)	50

## DELICIA.

By B. M. BUTT, author of 'Miss Molly.' 16mo (Leisure-Hour Series), \$1.

## Some Newspaper Tendencies.

An Address delivered before the Editorial Associations of New

York and Ohio. By WHITE LAW REID, Editor of the New York Tribune. 16mo, paper, 50 cents.

## COUSINS.

By I. B. WOLFORD, author of 'Mr. Smith.'

HENRY HOLT & CO., NEW YORK.

*THE MOTHER'S REGISTER: A Tabular Record of the Health of Children, from Birth to Maturity.* From the French of Prof. J. B. Foussagères. "The Mother records for the Physician to interpret." Cloth, 12mo. A separate volume for Boys and for Girls. Price, singly, 75 cents; for two, \$1.25. Sent, post-paid, on receipt of price, by the Publisher of the Nation.

*WALLACE'S Guide to the Adirondacks.* Maps, illustrations, etc. New (7th) ed. Paper, 75 cents; cloth, with large map, \$2. WAVERLY PUB. CO., SYRACUSE, N. Y.

## G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS,

132 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK.

Publish this week:

1. *STUDIES OF PARIS.* By Edmondo de Amicis, author of 'Constantinople,' 'Morocco,' 'Holland,' etc. 12mo, cloth extra, \$1 25.

A series of wonderfully vivid and dramatic pictures of the great world's metropolis, by a writer whose previous books have gained a reputation for exceptional clearness of perception and facility in description. There is hardly a writer who can rival him in his power of reproducing for his readers the very atmosphere of the places he describes. These 'Studies' include original and characteristic papers on the two authors whom he considers especially representative of the Paris of to-day—Hugo and Zola.

2. *BI-METALLISM.* A Lecture delivered at Harvard University by the Hon. Hugh McCulloch. (Economic Monographs, No. XVII.) Paper, 25 cents.

TWO STRONG NOVELS.

3. *THE BRETON MILLS: A Romance of New England Life.* By Charles J. Bellamy. 12mo, paper, 60 cents; cloth, \$1.

"A story showing, in addition to great skill in delineation of character, unquestionable dramatic power."

4. *UNDER THE BELLS: A Story of Life in France in the Sixteenth Century.* By Leonard Kip, author of 'The Dead Marquise.' 12mo, cloth extra, \$1 25.

\*.\* The above are for sale by all booksellers, and will be sent, post-paid, upon receipt of price, by the publishers.

## PRICE REDUCED.

THE BEST

## American Guide Books.

By M. F. SWEETSER.

*NEW ENGLAND.* 6 Maps, 11 Plans.*THE MIDDLE STATES.* 8 Maps, 15 Plans.*THE MARITIME PROVINCES.* 4 Maps, 4 Plans.*THE WHITE MOUNTAINS.* 6 Maps, 6 Panoramas.

Reduced from \$2 to \$1 50 c

"Faithful and picturesque in description, furnishing detail as to railroad routes and fares, routes of steam, hotel rates, and hack charges, and liberally supplied with maps and plans of cities, these books contain everything the traveller wants to know in precisely the shape he needs it."—*Boston Journal.*

\*.\* For sale by Booksellers. Sent, post-paid, upon receipt of price, by the Publishers.

HOUGHTON, OSGOOD & CO.,  
21 Astor Place, New York.

## Heliotype.

Permanent Photographic Book Illustrations.

THE HELIOTYPE PRINTING COMPANY are producers of Book Illustrations by the Heliotype, Photo-lithographic, and Photo-engraving processes. Employed by the United States Government in illustrating Scientific and Medical Reports, by Scientific, Historical, and other learned Societies, by the leading publishers, and for illustrating Town and Family Histories, etc., etc.

Facsimiles of Medals and Coins, Ancient MSS., Paintings, Drawings and Sketches, Views and Portraits from Nature, Medical and Scientific objects, Antiquities, etc., etc.

For terms and specimens apply to the

HELIOTYPE PRINTING COMPANY,  
220 Devonshire Street, Boston, Mass.

FOR HOME AND OFFICE LIBRARIES.

## THE PORTABLE BOOKCASE.

EASTLAKE DESIGN. PRICES REDUCED.

These cases, made of various woods, with leather fringe to match their furniture, are of exceptional value, and give the greatest satisfaction to all who use them. Two sizes, in walnut and pine, always on hand, and special cases of any size or wood promptly supplied. Send for descriptive circular and price-list. Address the sole makers,

LOCKWOOD, BROOKS &amp; CO., 381 Washington Street, Boston.

## F. W. CHRISTERN,

Foreign Bookseller and Importer,  
130 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK.

The principal publications of Charpentier, Didier, Didot, Hachette, Levy, etc., on hand; also, complete sets of Tauchnitz's collection of British Authors and Teubner's Greek and Roman Classics. Catalogues mailed on demand. European Periodicals received weekly.

*BINDER for the Nation, convenient for receiving the current numbers, also for permanent binder. Holds one volume. Price, in cloth, 40 cents; half-cloth, 25 cents (stamps). If sent by mail, 15 cents additional. Address THE NATION, Box 25, New York.*

## SILVER-PLATED WARE

MANUFACTURED BY THE

## Meriden Britannia Co.

No. 46 East Fourteenth Street,

UNION SQUARE,

NEW YORK.

## To Summer Tourists.

## ALLAN LINE

## ROYAL MAIL STEAMSHIPS

FROM BALTIMORE TO HALIFAX, and vice versa.

The A 1 British Iron Screw Steamships  
*HIBERNIAN*, 3,200 tons, Capt., Lieut. Archer, R.N.R.,  
*NOVA SCOTIAN*, 3,200 tons, Capt. Richardson,  
*CASPIAN*, 3,100 tons, Capt. Trocks,  
Leave Baltimore every other Wednesday for  
HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA.

Cabin Passage to Halifax, \$20 gold; Round-Trip ticket, \$35 gold, including everything except wines, etc.  
This is an excellent opportunity to enjoy a brief ocean trip on First-class Transatlantic Steamships and the charming summer climate of Nova Scotia.

First Cabin to St. John's, Newfoundland, \$35 gold; First Cabin to Liverpool, \$75 gold.

For further information apply to

A. SCHUMACHER &amp; CO.,

Or to 5 South Gay Street, Baltimore, Md.

LEVE &amp; ALDEN,

271 Broadway, New York.

## To Tourists.

The Lake Superior Transit Company's Excursion Rate Book for 1879 is now ready. Copies can be obtained of

T. P. CARPENTER, Gen. Pass. Agent,  
Atlantic Dock, Buffalo, N. Y.

## CUNARD LINE

ESTABLISHED 1840

## FOR QUEENSTOWN AND LIVERPOOL.

Sailing from New York every Wednesday. From Boston once a week.

## RATES OF PASSAGE:

CABIN—\$50, \$100, and \$150, gold, according to accommodation. Return tickets on favorable terms.

STEERAGE—\$25 currency. For freight or passage apply to

C. G. FRANCKLYN,

Bowling Green, New York.

## NORTH GERMAN LLOYD STEAMSHIP COMPANY

## FOR SOUTHAMPTON AND BREMEN.

The Steamers of this Company will sail every Saturday from Bremen Pier, foot of Third Street, Hoboken.

RATES OF PASSAGE TO LONDON, HAVRE, AND BREMEN.

First Cabin, \$100; Second Cabin, \$60 gold. Steerage, \$30 currency. For Freight or passage apply to

OELRICHS & CO., AGENTS,  
2 Bowling Green.

## BROWN BROTHERS &amp; CO.,

59 WALL STREET,

ISSUE COMMERCIAL AND TRAVELLERS' CREDITS

For use in

THIS COUNTRY AND ABROAD.

## WINSLOW, LANIER &amp; CO.,

BANKERS,

HAVE FOR SALE SECURITIES FOR SAFE AND PERMANENT INVESTMENT.

## S. G. &amp; G. C. WARD,

AGENTS FOR

BARING BROTHERS &amp; COMPANY

52 Wall Street, New York.

26 State Street, Boston.

## WILLIAM T. MEREDITH,

37 WILLIAM STREET, NEW YORK,

DEALER IN INVESTMENT SECURITIES AND COMMERCIAL PAPER.

## KOUNTZE BROTHERS,

BANKERS,

12 WALL STREET, NEW YORK,

Issue LETTERS OF CREDIT or CIRCULAR NOTES on the UNION BANK OF LONDON,

Available for Travellers in all parts of the world.

## WE ARE NOW FUNDING the Bonds of

Virginia and North Carolina.

We will send the new bonds promptly in exchange for the old. Forms for funding and all information furnished on application.

THOMAS BRANCH & CO.,  
BANKERS, ETC., RICHMOND, VA.

## Pratt's Astral Oil.

PERFECTLY SAFE.

Especially adapted for use in the St. Germain Student Lamp.

CHAS. PRATT &amp; CO.,

Box 3050.

NEW YORK

PATENT

## Prepared Gasolene

FOR GAS-MACHINES.

Made by a new method; an absolutely pure article. Does not deteriorate in quality as the process of evaporation within the machine progresses. Every barrel guaranteed.

Address the manufacturers,

CHARLES PRATT &amp; CO.

(Established 1770),

125 Pearl Street, New York.

OLD AND RELIABLE

## VANITY FAIR

(Flake Cut)

FRAGRANT VANITY FAIR TOBACCO AND CIGARETTES

(Long Cut).

"MILD"—Rare Old Virginia. "HALVES"—Rare Old Perique and Virginia. New Combinations of these Fragrant Tobaccos. Always up to the standard. Six First Prize Medals. Paris, 1878.

Peerless Tobacco Works.

WM. S. KIMBALL & CO.,  
Rochester, N. Y.

HENRY B. BULT,

## PRINT SELLER,

RARE AND FINE LINE ENGRAVINGS,  
ANCIENT PRINTS, PORTRAITS, ETCHINGS,  
PRINTS FOR ILLUSTRATING.

706 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.



